

**NARST
POLICIES &
PROCEDURES
MANUAL**

**Approved by the Board
18 October 2009**

Contents

NARST MISSION STATEMENT.....	7
CRITERIA FOR ADVANCING THE MISSION OF NARST	7
BOARD OF DIRECTORS.....	7
COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION AND THEIR PURPOSE.....	8
PROGRAM COMMITTEE.....	8
EQUITY AND ETHICS COMMITTEE	8
EXTERNAL POLICY AND RELATIONS COMMITTEE	8
RESEARCH COMMITTEE.....	8
PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE	9
MEMBERSHIP AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE	9
AWARDS COMMITTEE.....	9
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE.....	9
POLICY FOR NARST ELECTRONIC BOARD DISCUSSIONS AND VOTES.....	10
RATIONALE.....	10
POLICY	10
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR BEHAVIORS DEFINING NEGLIGENCE OF DUTY	11
BEHAVIORS DEFINING NEGLIGENCE OF DUTY	11
PROCEDURES FOR ACTION	11
Board Members	11
Ex officio Individuals Appointed by the Board.....	11
Strand Coordinators	12
Committee Chairs	12
Committee Members.....	12
Members of NARST.....	12
POLICY ON CREATION, DISSOLUTION, AND RENAMING OF STRANDS.....	12
RESEARCH INTEREST GROUP (RIG) FORMATION.....	13
STRAND CREATION, DISSOLUTION, AND RENAMING	13
Strand Creation.....	13
Strand Dissolution	14
Strand Renaming.....	14
POLICY FOR AFFILIATES AND ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIPS	14
NARST AFFILIATION POLICY	14
I. Purpose and Overview	14
II. What Organization May Become an Affiliate?	15
III. Types of Affiliations.....	15
IV. Procedures for Becoming an Affiliate of NARST.....	16
V. Rights and Responsibilities of NARST	16
VI. Rights and Responsibilities of the Affiliate	17
VII. Avoiding and Remediating Conflict of Interest.....	17
VIII. Procedures for Disaffiliation.....	17
NARST AFFILIATION PROCEDURES	18
Procedures for Becoming an Affiliate of NARST.....	18
Procedures related to appointing designees.....	18

Procedures related to the Affiliates Meeting(s).....	18
Procedures related to the Affiliation Report and Regular Review of the Affiliation	19
Procedures for Disaffiliation	19
GUIDELINES, PROCEDURES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR NARST MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS	19
REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSIDERING A NARST MEMBERSHIP	19
PROCEDURES FOR CREATING AND DISSOLVING MEMBERSHIPS	19
Procedures for Creating Memberships.....	19
Procedures for Dissolution.....	19
RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF MEMBERSHIP	19
PRESIDENTIAL TEAM DUTIES	21
PRESIDENTIAL DUTIES.....	21
PRESIDENT-ELECT	22
PAST-PRESIDENT DUTIES	22
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DUTIES	23
RESPONSIBILITIES OF NARST EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.....	23
Representing NARST.....	23
Liaison to the NARST Board.....	23
Financial Responsibilities	23
Coordination of NARST Board Meetings.....	23
Coordination of the NARST Elections	24
Communications	24
THE MANAGEMENT COMPANY’S DUTIES.....	24
MEMBERSHIP INQUIRIES	24
PUBLICATIONS INQUIRIES	24
ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE	24
FINANCES.....	24
WEB SITE	25
BOARD OF DIRECTORS.....	25
E-NARST NEWS.....	25
JRST	25
JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SCIENCE TEACHING.....	25
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POSITION OF EDITOR(S).....	25
High Levels of Organization and Management	25
Vision.....	25
Personal Qualifications	26
Edited Journal Production.....	26
Institutional Commitments.....	26
NARST Commitments	26
TRANSITION POLICY TO NEW EDITORS	26
Solicitation Phase.....	26
Early Transition Phase	26
Mid-Transition Phase	27
Late-Transition Period.....	27
Post-Transition Period.....	28
BUDGET FOR JRST FROM NARST	28
JRST EDITOR SEARCH COMMITTEE	28
APPLICATIONS FOR NEW JRST EDITORSHIP	28

NARST: CALL FOR NEW JRST EDITOR FOR 2010 - 2014	28
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POSITION	29
NARST COMMITMENTS	30
APPLICATIONS FOR EDITOR POSITION	30
NARST STANDING COMMITTEES	33
PROGRAM COMMITTEE	33
NARST Annual International Conference	33
1. Advisory Nature of Strands	33
2. Criteria to Be Used in Reviewing Proposals	33
3. Limits on the Number of Presentations	34
4. Requirements for First Author	34
5. Requirement of Manuscript Either on the NARST Conference CD or for Distribution at Conference	34
6. Proposal (Synopsis) Format (Upload)	34
7. Invited Strand Sessions	35
8. <i>SPECIFIC COORDINATOR STEPS IN PROCESSING PROPOSALS</i>	35
STEP 1. CHECKING THAT ALL PROPOSALS ARE COMPLETE, HAVE THE CORRECT FORMAT, AND HAVE NO INDICATORS OF NAMES OR INSTITUTIONS	35
STEP 2. REDIRECTING PROPOSALS AND CHECKING FOR PROPER SUBMISSION	36
STEP 3. SELECTING ASSESSORS	36
STEP 4. RESOLVING DISPUTES AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	38
STEP 5. SUBMITTING STRAND DECISIONS (SEPTEMBER 30TH)	38
STEP 6. SUBMITTING RECOMMENDED GROUPINGS (SEPTEMBER 30 TH)	39
GROUPING PAPER SETS	39
GROUPING POSTERS	39
STEP 7. RECOGNIZING ASSESSORS	40
9. SUMMARY OF DEADLINES IN PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS	40
10. APPENDICES	40
IMPORTANT FORMS ATTACHED: ASSESSOR'S LETTER, ASSESSOR'S RATING SHEET, RATINGS SUMMARY SHEET, & STRAND COORDINATOR'S RECOMMENDED GROUPINGS .	40
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE	48
CHARGE	48
PROCEDURES	48
DOCUMENTS AND SAMPLE LETTERS	48
NARST INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE SCHOLARSHIPS	49
PURPOSE	49
WHAT DO THE SCHOLARSHIPS COVER?	49
NUMBER OF SCHOLARSHIPS AND SCHOLARSHIP AMOUNT	49
WHO IS ELIGIBLE TO GET THE SCHOLARSHIPS?	49
SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION PROCEDURES:	50
SELECTION PROCESS	50
NARST 2009 International Committee Scholarships Application	50
NARST International Committee Scholarship Application Review Form	52
Linking Science Educators Program (LSEP)	53
LSEP Project Submission Form	56
LSEP Reviewer Form	59

PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE	61
Committee Charge.....	61
Committee Activities.....	61
Procedures and Timeline	61
E-NARST News Article Guidelines and Sample Timeline.....	62
EQUITY AND ETHICS COMMITTEE	63
Procedures.....	63
Timeline.....	63
Call for Application for Jhumki Basu Scholarships.....	63
Purpose	63
Scholarships	64
Eligibility.....	64
Application.....	64
EXTERNAL POLICY AND RELATIONS COMMITTEE	67
Committee Charge.....	67
Committee Activities.....	67
Procedures and Timeline	68
RESEARCH COMMITTEE.....	69
Charge	69
Activities.....	69
Procedures and Timeline	69
Call for NARST Pre-Conference Workshops.....	71
Solicitation Guidelines for NARST Sponsored Sessions.....	75
Request for Proposals to Host the 20XX Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students....	77
MEMBERSHIP AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE	80
Charge of the Committee.....	80
Procedure for Nominating and Rating Candidates for President-elect, Board Members at large, and International Coordinator.....	82
Election of NSTA Research Division Director	86
Documents and Sample Letters for Membership and Elections Committee.....	86
AWARDS COMMITTEE.....	92
Charge	92
Membership/Term of Service	92
Procedure for Changing Award Selection Committee Procedures	93
Procedure for Changing Awards.....	93
Code of Conduct	93
Duties of the Award Selection Committee Chairs.....	94
Duties of the Award Selection Committee Chairs.....	94
Criteria for Service on Award Selection Committees	95
Subcommittees of the Awards Committee	96
<i>JRST AWARD SELECTION COMMITTEE</i>	96
Charge	96
Procedures.....	96

Time Line and Due Dates:	96
Documents and Sample Letters.....	97
Criteria and Instructions for Ranking the Articles in an Issue of the JRST	98
JRST Award Article Evaluation Form.....	99
<i>NARST OUTSTANDING PAPER AWARD SELECTION COMMITTEE</i>	101
Charge	101
Procedure.....	101
Timeline.....	101
Documents and Sample Letters.....	102
Letter to Committee Members.....	103
<i>DISTINGUISHED CONTRIBUTION TO SCIENCE EDUCATION THROUGH RESEARCH AWARD SELECTION COMMITTEE</i>	106
Charge	106
The Award.....	106
Procedures	106
Call for Nominations	107
Criteria.....	107
<i>EARLY CAREER RESEARCH AWARD SELECTION COMMITTEE</i>	108
Charge	108
Procedures.....	108
Timeline.....	108
Call for nominations	109
Early Career Research Award Selection Committee Nominee Record Rating Sheet.....	110
<i>OUTSTANDING DOCTORAL RESEARCH AWARD SELECTION COMMITTEE</i>	111
Charge	111
Procedures.....	111
Timeline.....	112
Sample Call for Submissions for Outstanding Doctoral Research Award	113
Criteria for Judging NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award.....	114
Rating Sheet for NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award.....	115
Sample Letter to Finalist for NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award.....	116
Sample Letter to Non Finalist for NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award.....	117
NARST Web site Award Announcements on Awards Information for E-NARST News ..	118

Note: NARST Bylaws can be located on the Web at this URL:
<http://www.narst.org/about/mission.cfm>

NARST Mission Statement

NARST is a worldwide 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 policymakers; and 3) cooperating with other educational and scientific societies to influence educational policies.

Criteria for Advancing the Mission of NARST

To advance the mission of NARST, Strand members engage in and report on professional activities that contribute (but are not limited) to one or more Strand themes pertaining to the following outcomes:

1. Improvement of science teaching and learning through research;
2. Communication of research to researchers, practitioners, and policy makers pertaining to the improvement of science teaching and learning;
3. Promotion of universal scientific literacy; and/or
4. Cooperation with other educational and scientific societies to influence educational policies.

Board of Directors

The Board is comprised of 13 members who are elected by the membership of NARST. The elected members of the Board include: 3 elected Officers (President-elect, President, and Past-president), 9 elected Directors-at-large, and 1 elected International Coordinator. All elected members of the Board have full voting rights.

Ex officio members serve on the Board by virtue of representing NARST positions (e.g., Executive Director, Editor/s of JRST, and beginning in 2012 the NARST Liaison to NSTA [serving as the AOA representative]*) or by virtue of representing an affiliated organization (e.g., the NSTA Representative [the Research Director of NSTA]). The Board determines which NARST positions and/or affiliated organizations carry ex officio status. Ex officio members of the Board may participate fully in Board discussions and deliberations, but they do not possess voting rights.

The Board transacts all official business for NARST. The Board appoints Editors and Editorial boards to NARST's publications and determines their terms of office. The Board determines external organizations with which NARST is affiliated.

The Board of Directors will meet a minimum of three times a year: once at the beginning of the Annual International Conference, once at the end of the Annual International Conference, and once in October (generally the third weekend in October). The Board of Directors may use mail,

telephone, FAX and/or e-mail to transact business that must be conducted between regularly scheduled meetings.

* The NARST liaison to NSTA position was approved by the Board at the October 2010 Board Meeting. The person holding this position will serve as the AOA representative. The position is a 3-year appointed position and the individual holding the position will serve on the NARST Board as an Ex officio member. The first individual to hold this office will be appointed by the Board to assume office at the Board meeting following the 2012 Annual International Conference.

Committees of NARST and their Purpose

Program Committee

The Program Committee, consisting of 30 Strand Co-coordinators (with a chair and co-chair for each Strand), assists the program chair in planning and conducting the Annual International Conference. The Chair is the President of NARST and the Co-chair is the President-elect. Ex officio members include the Executive Director. Each Strand Coordinator serves for two years, first as a Co-chair and the following year as the Chair of the Strand. The Program Committee is responsible for the theme of the conference, organizing the call for submissions, the review process, and the organization of a program. Strand Coordinators assign assessors to proposals submitted for the Annual International Conference, facilitate the review of proposals, recommend accepted papers, and form groupings for conference sessions.

Equity and Ethics Committee

The Equity and Ethics Committee provides leadership and guidance to NARST on issues of equity and ethics including, but not limited to, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disabling conditions, sexual orientations, language, national origin and religion.

External Policy and Relations Committee

The External Policy and Relations Committee reviews existing and/or controversial educational policies at the state, national and international levels and works to inform NARST members about these policies. The committee commissions position papers based on research. These position papers should be based on current and innovative findings and distributed through the Publications Advisory Committee and Research Committee to the membership, policymakers, and the community-at-large. These position papers may not necessarily reflect a unified position for NARST; rather, they are meant to offer various perspectives of science education research to assist policymakers and the public-at-large in the decision making process. The Committee fosters the development of partnerships and collaborations with professional organizations/societies concerned with the quality of science teaching and learning.

Research Committee

The Research Committee develops, organizes and/or implements various professional development activities for the NARST membership. Such activities include selecting the Pre-conference Workshops to be offered at the Annual International Conference; identifying presenters for the allocated sessions at the NSTA conventions by selecting and coordinating presentations made by NARST members at these international conferences; conceptualizing,

developing, and/or disseminating reviews of research and white papers on appropriate topics for diverse audiences; and facilitating the review process for the submission of proposals and recommending to the Board the hosts for the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students*.

* At the October 2010 Board Meeting, the NARST Summer Research Institute was renamed the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students.

Publications Advisory Committee

The Publications Advisory Committee (PAC) serves in an advisory capacity for all NARST-sponsored publications, including JRST, position papers, and research-practice documents. The Chair is Editor of *E-NARST News*, a publication produced twice each year for NARST members that serves as a historical document of the activities of NARST. The PAC coordinates publication efforts with the External Policy and Relations Committee and the 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.

Membership and Elections Committee

The Membership and Elections Committee seeks new members from a variety of backgrounds and education arenas and retains active members by soliciting interest in committee membership throughout NARST, as well as for elected offices. In addition to developing a slate for annual elections, the committee is concerned with recruitment, retention, and responsiveness of NARST to members' interests.

Awards Committee

The Awards Committee oversees the work of the individual Award Selection Sub-committees. The Sub-committees solicit nominations and identify recipients for each of the NARST awards. In addition, the Sub-committees discuss issues related to equity and efficiency in the selection process, and the appropriateness of each award considering the NARST mission. The Awards Committee shall recommend changes in awards or procedures to the Board of Directors.

International Committee

The International Committee (IC) develops and organizes various professional development activities for the NARST members with International Organizations, including IC-sponsored seminars at the NARST Annual International Conference, the European Science Education Research Association (ESERA) meeting, and the Australasian Science Education Research Association (ASERA) meeting. The IC organizes the NARST Mentor-Mentee Nexus, coordinates a scholarship program, and has an annual call for proposals for the Linking Science Educators Program (LSEP). The IC seeks to actively participate at international association conferences by organizing, selecting, and coordinating presentations made by NARST international members. In addition, the Committee offers recommendations to the Board regarding issues of interest to the IC related to awards, procedures, or other NARST programs.

Policy for NARST Electronic Board Discussions and Votes

Rationale

Electronic voting is essential for NARST to conduct its business in a timely manner. The NARST Board conducts most of its business at the three Board Meetings. However, in the spirit of efficiency and timeliness, electronic discussions and votes may be conducted. Caution should be given, however, as Board Members should not use electronic voting to compensate for lack of planning or organization. The Board should be looking ahead to maximize the time used during the regular Board Meetings.

Policy

- Roberts Rules of Order, Revised, are used in Board meetings. Electronic votes follow similar procedures. The NARST President serves as the parliamentarian for business conducted electronically.
- The President has the right to decide which items of business can be conducted electronically and which should be held for the next regular Board Meeting. Therefore, the President can “table” electronic business and bring it to the next Board Meeting.
- When a Board Member wishes to offer a motion, the motion should be sent to the President. The President organizes all electronic discussions and votes.
- The President forwards the motion to all Board members, identifying the person who offered the motion.
- It is the responsibility of each Board member to acknowledge receipt of the motion within 3 business days and indicate availability to engage in an electronic discussion over the next 10 business days.
- When Board members cast a vote, they should reply to all – not solely to the President.
- It is the responsibility of the President and the Board member offering the motion to supply to the Board at the time the motion is made all relevant information needed to make informed decisions. For example, motions with financial implications need to have accompanying NARST financial status information. Motions to vote on individuals for positions need to include resumes.
- The President confirms an “electronic presence” of the majority of the Board via these acknowledgements. When this has been established, the President calls for a second to the motion, giving a specific timeline to respond. It is suggested that a second be received no later than 3 business days after the motion has been sent to the Board. The President may elect to delay a discussion if he/she thinks an absent member is crucial to the discussion.
- Once a second has been made, the President identifies the person making the second and calls for a discussion. The President specifies a time frame for holding the discussion, but it is recommended that no more than 3 business days be taken for the discussion.
- When Board members discuss a motion, they should reply to all – not solely to the President.
- After the discussion has occurred, the President calls for the vote. It is recommended that 3 business days be given to cast votes.
- The President provides to the Board the final tally of votes showing the names of those Board members who are in favor, opposed, or abstained. The names of members who did not vote should also be shown.

- A section is included in the forthcoming Board Book that includes a record of all the electronic votes. Such votes should be reflected in the minutes and approved with the minutes as a means of documenting the accuracy.

Policies and Procedures for Behaviors Defining Negligence of Duty

Because NARST relies on volunteers to conduct its business, there must be a level of commitment on the part of the members to fulfill their obligations. For the most part, members are dedicated and responsible, with many devoting numerous hours to assigned tasks. The policy and procedures outlined here are designed for the small number of individuals who interfere with Committee or Board functions due to negligence of duty. In ALL cases, the first step should be for the Chair or a member of the Presidential Team (President, President-elect, Past president) to have a conference with the individual and determine what is creating the situation. Every effort should be made to maintain open lines of communication among involved parties.

Behaviors Defining Negligence of Duty

These behaviors include, but are not exclusive to, a pattern of:

- consistently missing meetings, or not attending meetings for their entirety, without a valid apology;
- not responding to a written, voicemail and/or email request made by a Committee Chair, Strand Coordinator and/or a Presidential Team Member;
- failing to complete an assigned task in a timely manner;
- engaging in acts of discrimination or intolerance.

Procedures for Action

If a Board Member, Ex officio Member, Strand Coordinator, Committee Chair or Committee member is negligent in duties, the following actions will be taken:

Board Members

- The Presidential Team, led by the President, will discuss the matter with her/him to determine if there are extenuating circumstances involved.
- If the situation does not improve, the individual will be asked to resign. This request for the individual's resignation would be determined by a two-thirds majority vote of the Board.
- His/her replacement would normally be the individual who would have been the next person to be elected by the membership. Nevertheless, with the approval of the Board, the President would appoint an individual to the vacant post. In certain circumstances, the Board may determine that a replacement is not necessary.

Ex officio Individuals Appointed by the Board

- The Presidential Team, led by the President, will discuss the matter with her/him to determine if there are extenuating circumstances involved.
- If the situation does not improve, the individual will be asked to resign. This request for the individual's resignation would be determined by a two-thirds majority vote of the Board.

- With the approval of the Board, the President would appoint an individual to the vacant President.

Strand Coordinators

- The Presidential Team, led by the President, will discuss the matter with her/him to determine if there are extenuating circumstances involved.
- If the situation does not improve, the President asks the Strand coordinator to resign, and then she/he replaces this individual with another person.

Committee Chairs

- The President, will discuss the matter with her/him to determine if there are extenuating circumstances involved.
- If, in the President's judgment, the problem cannot be resolved, then the President will ask the Committee Chair to resign as Chair. The President will then appoint another Chair from the membership of the committee. The President may also appoint an additional committee member from the membership if the former Chair declines to continue to participate as a member of the committee.

Committee Members

- The Committee Chair will report the matter to the President and ask what steps should be taken, e.g., work with the person, replace the person.
- The President or President-elect, depending on the timing, writes a letter of thanks to the individual and then appoints a new individual to the committee.

Members of NARST

- If a member of NARST engages in acts of discrimination or intolerance as part of official NARST activity (i.e., Annual International Conference participation, communications around NARST sessions), then such intolerance should be reported to the Chair of the Equity and Ethics Committee and/or the President.
- If, in the President's judgment, the problem sufficiently breaches the NARST code of conduct for discrimination and intolerance, then a Presidential Team will be appointed and led by the President to seek evidence of intolerance or discrimination, and will engage in formal dialog with all involved parties, including both the accused and the accuser. The Presidential Team, in collaboration with the involved parties, will then decide upon a course of action.

Policy on Creation, Dissolution, and Renaming of Strands

NARST encourages its members to engage in research that is consistent with and advances its mission. Members' research topics are grouped into broad, general categories of similar interest called Strands. Each year NARST announces a "call for proposals" and groups reports of its members' research by Strands for presentation on the program of the Annual International Conference. A count of the presentations and publications of Strand members that advance NARST's mission is a measure of member activity in an existing Strand. The Strands also provide an informal forum for the interaction of its members who are drawn together by a common interest in a unique field of study, teaching, or research.

Research Interest Group (RIG) Formation

When the existing Strand structure does not facilitate such activity, members may form a Research Interest Group (RIG). Time is specifically allocated on the program of the Annual International Conference for Strand and RIG members to meet. Each Strand represents a common category of research interest of its members, and each RIG reflects a unique research interest. The number of RIGs is independent of the number of Strands.

RIGs are dedicated to member interests and commitments. RIGs serve the interests of the membership by influencing the policy, procedures, and activities of NARST with the assistance of the Board. RIGs are proposed by petition of the members and are approved and rescinded by the Board.

To create a RIG, a petition of 10 NARST members must be forwarded to the Board. The petition should include the following: Name of the RIG; purpose; name of a long-term contact person; description of chair selection and rotation; the administrative structure of the RIG; potential plans of action; and length of existence (typically three years). A renewal application should include all of the information in the original petition and a list of previous accomplishments. The Board may reject an application for renewal if the RIG has limited membership (less than 10), has accomplished few goals, or has inconsistently submitted RIG reports to the Board. RIG's may be approved or rescinded at any Board meeting or between Board meetings following the policy for NARST electronic Board discussions and votes.

RIGs are responsible for the recruitment and maintenance of their own membership; for communication among members; and for selecting their own projects, goals, and activities. Each RIG will hold a minimum of one RIG meeting at the Annual International Conference (space, time, and advisement of location to be provided by the Program Committee) and may meet as needed throughout the year using alternative formats.

Established RIGs may access all NARST support structures by following the Policies and Procedures. For instance, RIGs may suggest Keynote speakers or conference Strands by working through the Program Committee, may recommend publications by working with the Publications Advisory Committee, may monitor and enhance membership by working with the Membership and Elections Committee, etc.

Each RIG chair will be expected to provide a written report to the Board for each Board Meeting and will be provided time during the Board Meeting immediately following the Annual International Conference to present updates of actions or initiatives.

Strand Creation, Dissolution, and Renaming

1. The Board creates, dissolves, or renames a Strand.
2. The Chair of the Research Committee recommends to the Board that a Strand be created, dissolved, or renamed by majority vote of members of the Research Committee.
3. The Research Committee is charged with the responsibility of reviewing and recommending that a Strand be created, dissolved, or renamed.
4. Members of NARST may petition the Research Committee to create, dissolve, or rename a Strand.

Strand Creation

1. The Chair of the Research Committee recommends to the Board that members of the Research Committee wish to create a Strand.
2. A sponsoring member of NARST recommends that a Strand be created through petition to the members of the Research Committee.

3. A sponsor who submits a petition to the Research Committee for its consideration must demonstrate that the proposed Strand contributes to and advances NARST's mission and must document sustained interest for a minimum of two years by at least 5% of NARST's members.
4. Examples of sustained interest may include, but are not limited to, research publications, presentations, and meetings in Research Interest Groups (RIGs) by NARST's members.
5. On approval of the Board, the President-elect appoints the Strand Coordinator(s).

Strand Dissolution

1. The Research Coordinator recommends to the Board that members of the Research Committee wish to dissolve a Strand.
2. Members of the Research Committee review periodically the activity level to determine that existing Strands reflect the research interests of NARST's members and advance NARST's mission.
3. A Strand may be recommended for dissolution by majority vote of the Research Committee, when members of NARST fail to support it - as reflected by lack of sustained interest for at least two years - and/or the interests of its members no longer advance NARST's mission.
4. A Strand may be recommended for dissolution by a majority vote of its active members.
5. Lack of sustained interest as reflected by participation on the program of the Annual International Conference and contribution to NARST's mission is established in consultation with the Strand Coordinator(s) and/or member(s).

Strand Renaming

1. The Chair of the Research Committee offers the Committee's recommendation to the Board to rename a Strand.
2. A Strand Coordinator or member petitions the Research Committee to rename a Strand.
3. A Strand Coordinator or member who submits a petition to the Research Committee must demonstrate support for renaming the Strand by a majority vote of the members who are active in the existing Strand.

Policy for Affiliates and Organizational Memberships

NARST Affiliation Policy

I. Purpose and Overview

The NARST Affiliation Policy is directed towards establishing and developing productive working relationships with organizations interested in policy, practices and research in science education. The aim is to encourage substantive projects in science education that extend beyond existing activities and are made possible and enriched by the joint approaches of the affiliates. Such projects might involve members of the affiliated organizations in joint organization of conference sessions, co-authorization of position/policy statements, research studies, joint or co-sponsored publications, joint events for doctoral students, co-sponsored professional learning communities, and so on. The Affiliation Policy seeks to contribute to a heightened mutual appreciation of and engagement in the perspectives and practices of science education organizations.

NARST Statement of Purpose: NARST is a worldwide 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.

II. What Organization May Become an Affiliate?

An organization may become an affiliate of NARST if the organization:

- A. Demonstrates through its mission and actions a dedication to promoting quality science education;
- B. Represents a major national or international organization whose goals are congruent those of NARST;
- C. Has an articulated purpose (e.g., in its Constitution or Bylaws) that is in concert with the Bylaws of NARST;
- D. Has elected officer(s);
- E. Endorses the affiliation with NARST;
- F. Is a not-for-profit or non-governmental organization (e.g., in the US, is a 501 (c) (3) organization);
- G. Agrees to be signatories of a protective exclusion clause, as outlined in the Affiliation Agreement;
- H. Signs a mutually beneficial Memorandum of Understanding.

III. Types of Affiliations

A. NARST Affiliates are of three main types. The type of affiliation will be determined in part through characterizing the membership profile and goals of the Affiliate organization. These categories are intended to reflect a primary focus, not an exclusive focus, of the Affiliate. Some Affiliations may reflect multiple types.

1. Research Affiliations

The goal for Research Affiliations is to promote productive collaboration between NARST and the Affiliate toward the goal of sharing and fostering high-quality science education research worldwide.

2. Policy and Research Affiliations

The goal for Policy and Research Affiliations is to promote productive collaboration between NARST and the Affiliate toward the goal of using research to inform science education related policy, in addition to promoting the broader reach of science education research.

3. Practice and Research Affiliations

The goal for Practice and Research Affiliations is to promote productive collaboration between NARST and the Affiliate toward the goal of using research to inform science education related practice, in addition to promoting the broader reach of science education research.

B. All types of affiliations will engage in appropriate collaborative work as described in Sections V and VI.

C. The type of affiliation and associated collaborative work guide the contents of a Memorandum of Understanding.

IV. Procedures for Becoming an Affiliate of NARST

The following procedure must be followed for a petitioning organization to become an affiliate of NARST:

The President, Executive Director, or equivalent of the petitioning organization will provide a *Letter of Request* to the NARST Executive Director 3 months prior to a NARST Board of Directors meeting. (The NARST Board meets at the NARST Annual International Conference, and during the third weekend of October.) Documentation indicating adherence to the Affiliate requirements cited in Section II should be included. The appropriate committees will review the request. This review will be followed by a discussion and vote of the NARST Board. The NARST President will inform the petitioning organization of the outcome of the vote. If the affiliation is approved, a Memorandum of Understanding must be signed. In the case of denial, a rationale will be outlined to the petitioning organization, and after a period of joint reworking of the request, the petitioning organization may resubmit a Letter of Request.

Reciprocally, NARST will follow any of the petitioning organization's procedures for becoming an affiliate of that organization.

V. Rights and Responsibilities of NARST

NARST maintains certain rights and responsibilities with regard to the affiliations. NARST will:

1. Designate a liaison to be the point of contact to the affiliate to coordinate or facilitate joint activities.
2. Fulfill all responsibilities to the Affiliate as identified in a Memorandum of Understanding.
3. Extend to Affiliate President or designee all rights and privileges of an Affiliate as specified in a Memorandum of Understanding.
4. Organize and host an annual Affiliates meeting (or meetings) for Affiliate representatives and NARST leadership, to address issues of importance to the NARST Affiliates.
5. Review the Memorandum of Understanding and the Affiliation Report (required every two years; collaboratively generated by the designees from the Affiliate and NARST), and adjust the Memorandum of Understanding and the structures for support as necessary and as mutually agreed upon.

6. Inform the Affiliate of all newly elected officers and Board Members, of any changes in Bylaws, and of all relevant conferences, seminars, etc. that are being conducted by or in conjunction with NARST in a timely manner.

7. Abide by the Affiliate's policies or statements regarding conflict of interest.

VI. Rights and Responsibilities of the Affiliate

The Affiliate organization maintains certain rights and responsibilities. The Affiliate organization will:

1. Designate a liaison to be the point of contact from the affiliate to NARST to coordinate or facilitate joint activities.

2. Fulfill all responsibilities to NARST as identified in a Memorandum of Understanding.

3. Extend to NARST all rights and privileges of Affiliates as specified in a Memorandum of Understanding.

4. Represent the affiliate in an annual Affiliates Meeting.

5. Submit an Affiliation Report every second year describing what the affiliation has accomplished and how the affiliation is being fostered. This report should discuss how the affiliation could be better fostered or strengthened. The Affiliate designee and the NARST designee for that Affiliation should collaboratively write this report.

6. Inform the NARST Executive Director of all newly elected officers and Board Members, of any changes in Constitution or Bylaws, and of all relevant conferences, seminars, etc. that are being conducted by or in conjunction with the Affiliate in a timely manner.

7. Abide by NARST's statements regarding conflict of interest.

VII. Avoiding and Remediating Conflict of Interest

NARST is guided by The National Academies' definition of conflict of interest: "any financial or other interest which conflicts with the service of the individual because it (1) could significantly impair the individual's objectivity or (2) could create an unfair competitive advantage for any person or organization" (<http://www.nationalacademies.org/coi/index.html>; retrieved July 21, 2009). Specifically with regard to NARST Affiliates, conflict of interest will be defined as an instance in which a member of the NARST Board has a vested interest in a particular Affiliate organization, or when an Affiliate organization board member (or equivalent) has a vested interest in NARST. Conflicts of interest and potential conflicts of interest will be remediated with involvement from the potentially conflicted individual and members of the leadership groups of NARST and the Affiliate organization.

VIII. Procedures for Disaffiliation

Disaffiliation will be accomplished through written notice and Board action.

A. Written notice by initiating organization

1. 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.

2. 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.

B. Board Action

1. 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.
2. The governing body of the disaffiliating organization must confirm such disaffiliation, and accommodate for this action in their Constitution or Bylaws and 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.

C. Re-affiliation

The disaffiliated organization may request to re-affiliate through the processes described in Section IV.

NARST Affiliation Procedures

Procedures for Becoming an Affiliate of NARST

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 chair or co-chairs of the External Policy and Relations Committee. The External Policy and Relations Committee and at least one other appropriate committee will review the documentation and, in consultation with the NARST President, 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 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 report at the subsequent Board meeting or, if that is not possible, at another regularly 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.

Procedures related to 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.

Procedures related to the Affiliates 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 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 chair of 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.

Multiple meetings will be held for different types of affiliations (i.e., research, policy and research, or practice and research affiliations) if appropriate.

Procedures related to the 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 Report on a regular basis.

Procedures for Disaffiliation

In some instances the letter of disaffiliation may serve as notice indicating that the Affiliation is in a probationary status and stating specific steps that must be taken to rectify the probationary status within 12 months. In others, this may serve as notice of the disaffiliation itself.

Guidelines, Procedures, and Responsibilities for NARST Membership in Professional Organizations

Definition of Organizational Membership: NARST, as a professional society, registers as a member, and in some cases pays membership dues, to certain organizations to allow participation on matters related to science education. Typically Organizational Membership includes sending a NARST representative to meetings of the organization. Current NARST memberships include AAAS and CSSP.

Requirements for Considering a NARST Membership

NARST considers membership as an organization in societies that share some part of their mission with NARST. NARST membership in that society must promote the NARST mission and benefit NARST members.

Procedures for Creating and Dissolving Memberships

Procedures for Creating Memberships

1. The NARST External Policy and Relations Committee will receive and evaluate all nominations for NARST to become an Organizational Member and make a recommendation to the NARST Board. Nominations should include a letter from the governing body of the nominated society indicating that society's mission, their reasons for seeking association with NARST, and specific ways such association will benefit the respective societies.
2. The NARST Board will vote on the nomination.

The NARST President will discuss the results of the vote with the appropriate governing body of the membership.

Procedures for Dissolution

1. A society may dissolve NARST membership at any time by submitting a letter to the NARST President, who will inform the board of the intents of the society.
2. NARST may dissolve membership in a professional society via deliberation and action of the NARST Board. The NARST President will inform the society of the results of such deliberation.

Rights and Responsibilities of Membership

The NARST, as an organizational member in a professional society, will:

1. Support travel by a NARST representative to meetings of the society;
2. Pay dues as required;
3. Fulfill other responsibilities associated with the membership.

The NARST representative to the professional society will:

1. Fulfill responsibilities to the society associated with their representation.
2. Submit a written report biannually to the NARST Board.

Presidential Team Duties

Presidential Duties

MONTH	DUTY
April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare online system for upcoming proposal submissions
May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with President-elect and the Program Committee to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • finalize the conference theme • finalize call for proposals • update directions for Strand coordinators
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 15, Call for Proposals goes out
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite speakers for conference keynote sessions • August 15, proposals due • Call for Board and Committee Sponsored Proposals
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write President's report for Fall Board Meeting • Prepare report of the annual international conference for Fall Board Meeting • Oversee entire proposal review process • Strand Coordinators to post accept/reject proposals
October Early	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strand Coordinators post to the conference Web site the recommended Strand sessions (President can do final check of accepts/rejects) • Work with President-elect and the Program Committee to finalize preliminary program
November Early	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send thank you letters to Strand Coordinators and Assessors • Obtain advertisers for conference (Book publishers, etc.) • Begin advertising special sessions and keynotes of the conference
December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that election is organized
January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize scheduling of the program and begin working with DMG on program book
February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicate with membership and committee members regarding upcoming conference • February 20, Conference Proceeding CD Deadline • Communicate with Poster Presenters about poster guidelines
March Early	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask Strand Coordinators to write summary for their Strand and post it on web before conference • Prepare announcements for listserv to highlight conference themes, etc. • Prepare agenda for 1st Spring Board meeting
Late	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare introductions for the various general session speakers at the Annual International Conference and introductions at Awards Luncheon
At Annual International Conference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare brief speech for end of awards banquet • Visit all committee meetings and thank members for serving

President-elect

The President-elect will work in close collaboration with the President on developing the Conference, its theme and the submissions for the conference. The President-elect will undertake duties as delegated by the President with particular responsibilities as follows:

Entire Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shadow Current President in preparation for Presidential year
February Early	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Working with Committee Chairs and Executive Director, compile list of members to be placed on committees; e-mail individuals on list to confirm interest in specific committees• Think about ad-hoc committees required• Select new Strand Coordinators• Send out committee members and Strand Coordinators list to Board for a vote• Prepare President-elect reports for Spring Board Meeting
Late	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Send letters to new committee members and Strand Coordinators notifying them of approval and of committee meeting times at the conference

Past-President Duties

May to Sept	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work with the chair of the Membership Committee to solicit nominees for new Board members and President-elect.• Contact nominees running for President-elect• Organize a discussion with the Membership committee of the ranking of individuals to approach to stand for the forthcoming election.• Prepare reports for the Fall and Spring Board Meetings.• Represent NARST on the board of an affiliate, as agreed to by Presidential team.• Chair the Policy Advisory Committee and update Policies and Procedures Manual and Bylaws, if needed.• Consult with Presidential Team on issues as they arise.• The Past-President serves as one of the co-Chairs of the Membership & Elections Committee.
-------------	---

Executive Director Duties

Responsibilities of NARST Executive Director

The following list indicates the roles and responsibilities expected of the Executive Director.

Representing NARST

- Represent NARST and its policies, both within the organization and to external bodies, as and when required.

Liaison to the NARST Board

- Support the work of the Board, both electronically and at its Board meetings.
- Participate in policy discussions with the NARST Board.
- Serve as an ex-officio member on the various NARST Standing Committees.

Financial Responsibilities

- Develop and monitor the annual NARST budget.
- Make budgetary recommendations to the Board throughout the year.
- Monitor the NARST investment accounts and communicate with our Financial Advisors on a quarterly basis.
- Collaborate with the accounting staff at the Management group to monitor and review the monthly accounts payable statements, budget statements and all investment reports and transactions.
- Assist the accounting staff in preparing materials for the annual NARST audit and IRS 990 tax reporting obligations.
- Approve all invoices related to NARST budgeted services and obligations.
- Solicit bids for any NARST equipment purchases.
- Communicate with the NARST leadership team regarding any special budgetary requests.
- Monitor our NARST insurance coverage, including the Director's & Officer's policy as well as the General Liability policy.

Coordination of NARST Board Meetings

- Attend all NARST Board meetings.
- Collaborate with the DMG staff and NARST Presidential team regarding hotel contracts and associated financial decisions.
- Coordinate with DMG staff to arrange the fall and spring meetings of the NARST Board.
- Arrange lodging for the executive team and the registration desk staff at the Annual International Conference.
- Collaborate with the individuals arranging local tourism opportunities for NARST members at each conference site.
- Prepare the NARST award information for ordering the plaques prior to the Annual International Conference.
- Arrange for graduate students to staff the registration desk and check for registration badges at sessions at the Annual International Conference.
- Be responsible for signing all official documents on behalf of the NARST organization, including contracts for services, tax documents and investment account documents.
- Serve as a contact for the NARST attorney concerning legal matters for the organization.

Coordination of the NARST Elections

- Communicate with the Membership & Elections Committee about soliciting the candidates' biographical materials.
- Negotiate the contract with various vendors for the annual online voting process.
- Format the candidates' biographical statements for electronic posting and/or for mailing, as part of the elections process; prepare the electronic version of the ballot to be used in the election and administer the elections.
- Coordinate with the DMG staff concerning the mailing of paper ballots to those members without e-mail addresses in the database.
- Advise the Presidential team of those elected, and notify all candidates that they were either elected or not.

Communications

- Receive telephone calls and e-mails concerning NARST questions and issues, which the Management company are unable to answer.
- Maintain and update our NARST organizational information in the databases for other professional organizations, such as AAAS, ASTE, NSTA, CSSP, and others.
- Communicate with our various NARST staff members, affiliates and committees, including the Wiley publishers, editor(s) of the *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* (JRST), hotel sales representatives, etc.

The Management Company's Duties

Currently, NARST contracts with a Management company to undertake the following duties:

Membership inquiries

- Renewal of membership
- New memberships
- Cancellation
- Receipt of money
- Address changes

Publications inquiries

Annual International Conference

Produce a conference program (including editing and printing) for the Annual International Conference.

Prepare a CD prior to the Annual International Conference of papers voluntarily submitted for inclusion. By voluntarily including a paper to be presented on the CD, presenters are excluded from the requirement of distributing a paper at the conference. The CD is distributed with the program to all attendees at the Annual International Conference. The deadline for all papers to be submitted to the management company is February 20th (unless otherwise announced based upon the dates of the conference).

Searching for hotels, liaising with the hotel to organize room set-up, organizing food and beverage and audio-visual, reserving Boardrooms and organizing reservations.

Finances

Maintain a record of all financial transactions and accounts for auditing.

Producing summary reports for the Board as required.

Pay expenses and other invoices.

Web site

Maintain the NARST Web site and undertake revisions, as necessary.

Maintain the two NARST listservs (public and members-only) and circulate messages as required.

Organize a system for proposal submission and peer review for the Annual International Conference.

Organize a system for electronic payment of annual dues and conference registration fees.

Board of Directors

Organize the three Executive Board meetings per year: one just before the Annual International Conference; one immediately after just after the Annual International Conference, and one in October (generally the third weekend of each October). Produce the agenda and compile the reports submitted by Board Members in advance of the meeting.

E-NARST News

Production of electronic pdf from text and photographs provided by Chair of the Publications Advisory Committee and formatted by the management company

Post the *E-NARST News* to the NARST Web site

JRST

Provide Wiley-Blackwell, publisher of JRST, with a list of addresses of members.

Undertake address corrections.

Provide Wiley-Blackwell with new members throughout the year to ensure the delivery of back-orders of JRST.

Journal of Research in Science Teaching

The *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* is the official journal of NARST. Currently, a contract exists with Wiley-Blackwell until the year 2020 for its publication. Editors appointed by the Board edit the journal for a period of five years (cover issues of the journal: 2006-2010; 2011-2015; 2016-2020). Editors of the journal are ex officio members of the Board of Directors.

Responsibilities of the Position of Editor(s)

High Levels of Organization and Management

- Show evidence of being able to administer a large flow of manuscripts each year and to process them in an effective manner.

Vision

- Indicate very clearly the vision that they have, not only for ensuring that *JRST* continues to be a premier journal, but also for taking the organization into the new millennium through innovative and creative leadership. This vision should be consistent with the published vision of NARST.

- Be committed to a diversity of styles of research and ensure that the review process remains international so as to reflect multiple perspectives and diversity.

Personal Qualifications

- Be an active member of NARST with high visibility within the organization such as being a regularly attendee at conferences.
- Be a respected scholar in science education, have a strong research record of publications in high-quality journals, and possess excellent writing and editing skills.
- Have a strong commitment to maintaining the high quality of manuscripts that are published in the Journal.

Journal Production and Responsibilities

- Be responsible for producing 10 issues of *JRST* per year.
- Attend NARST Board Meetings: one just before the Annual International Conference; one immediately after just after the Annual International Conference, and one in October (generally the third weekend of each October).

Institutional Commitments

- Office space for accommodating journal production activities.
- Computers to process the journal including electronic mail.

NARST Commitments

- Financial support is provided by Wiley-Blackwell in accordance with the contract with NARST to cover editorial expenses, which may include: graduate student support, administrative aide support, computer equipment and software, and travel.
- Provide financial support to attend the October NARST Board Meeting (this does not include support to attend the Annual International Conference, additional lodging is provided if necessary in the same manner as provided to Board Members).
- 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.

Transition Policy to New Editors

Solicitation Phase

The solicitation for the new *JRST* editor(s) will be sent out in the fall of Year 4 of current editorship, with a deadline for submissions set for January 31 of Year 5 of the current editorship. Selection of the new *JRST* editorial team would be finalized at the spring NARST Annual International Conference during Year 5 of the current editorship. The new *JRST* editor(s) will:

- attend the *JRST* Board Meeting held at the Annual International Conference (in Year 5 of the current editorship); conduct the *JRST* Board Meeting the first year of editorship.
- assume full editorial responsibilities for the journal beginning the January 1 following the 5th year of the retiring editor(s).

Early Transition Phase

The early transition period for the incoming *JRST* editor(s) would occur during Year 5 of the current editorship. During this time, the current *JRST* editor(s) would continue all editorial responsibilities for the journal while the incoming *JRST* editor(s) will

- engage in discussions with the current *JRST* editors on the editorial process as it is conducted in Manuscript Central;
- meet with representatives from John Wiley & Sons to establish a working relationship;
- commence training in Manuscript Central; finalize the incoming editorial team (including associate editors and *JRST* staff);
- recruit graduate associate personnel, if needed (starting date, fall of transition year);
- draft editorials for *JRST* (with suggested publication dates of January and February during Year 1, respectively) that would delineate the new editor(s)' vision for the journal and introduce the new editorial team to the readership;
- work with Wiley-Blackwell to design a new cover for *JRST*, if needed.

Mid-Transition Phase

The Mid Transition period would occur in the early fall during Year 5 of the current editorship. During this time, the current *JRST* editor(s) would continue all editorial responsibilities for the journal while the incoming *JRST* editor(s) will:

- establish the incoming *JRST* Editorial Office;
- draft and submit to Wiley edited Information for Contributors Information (this would include the names and contact information of the editor(s) in the new *JRST* Editorial Office);
- orient any incoming associate editors to their roles and responsibilities in the *JRST* editorial process;
- commence associate editors' training of the electronic submission, review and communication system, ScholarOne Central (S1C);
- submit *JRST* proposals for upcoming NARST conference.

Late-Transition Period

The Late Transition period would occur in late Fall during Year 5 of the current editorship. During this time, the current *JRST* editor(s) will continue all editorial responsibilities for the journal, while collaborating with the incoming *JRST* editor(s) to assign newly submitted manuscripts to the incoming editor(s). During this time, the incoming *JRST* editorial team will:

- finalize their training of S1C;
- submit new editor(s)' editorials in MC;
- edit all publication decision letters and automated communication messages in MC to reflect the new editorial teams' names, contact information, and preferred text;

- begin the process of recruiting new editorial board members to submit to the NARST Publication Advisory Committee for appointment consideration during the early part of Year 1 of new editorial team.

Post-Transition Period

The Post-Transition Period will occur during the winter/spring of Year 1 of the new editorship. During this time the new *JRST* editor(s) will be fully responsible for the editing of the journal, including: negotiation with the publisher for a new journal cover to start on issue 1, Year 2 of the new editorship, when the *JRST* inside cover will contain the masthead information for the new editorial team. The immediate past *JRST* Editors will continue their editorial responsibilities in regard to previously accepted with revisions manuscripts that had received such a decision prior to January 1 of Year 1 for the new editors. The decision on manuscripts previously accepted with revisions must be finalized within the first 3 months of the new editorial team's term or manuscripts may be subjected to new review at the discretion of the new editor(s).

Budget for JRST from NARST

The transition budget for the incoming *JRST* editor(s) will be negotiated with the NARST Board of Directors. The annual operating budget is a contract with Wiley-Blackwell. For the new editorship to start in 2010, the budget from Wiley-Blackwell to the *JRST* Editors is \$35,000 in 2010, \$40,000 in years 2011 through 2015, and \$45,000 in years 2016 through 2010. The current contract with Wiley-Blackwell extends through 2020.

JRST Editor Search Committee

Every five years NARST needs to organize a committee to advertise for NARST members to apply for the position of *JRST* Editor. In Summer 2008 we advertised for the *JRST* Editor. The Chair of the committee was Immediate Past President. For other committee members we 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. The following advertisement for the *JRST* Editor was posted on the Web site for one month.

Applications for New JRST Editorship

Interested persons are encouraged to discuss the nature of this position informally with the chair of the search committee –Penny J. Gilmer, Past-President and Chair of the *JRST* Editor Search Committee at gilmer@chem.fsu.edu or by telephone at (850) 644-4026, 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 August 10, 2008 at which time a mailing address will be provided for submitting final submissions due by September 12, 2008.

NARST: Call for New *JRST* Editor for 2010 - 2014

The National Association for Research in Science Teaching is searching for the new Editor of the *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* for 2010 - 2014. 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 2009. Full responsibilities as Editor will be from January 2010 through December 2014, with the Editor(s) on the cover of *JRST* 2011 – 2015. The first issue for which the new Editor is fully responsible (January 2011) 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.

NARST Commitments

The NARST organization will provide: 1) financial support up to \$35,000 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 (J. Randy McGinnis and Angelo Collins; jrst@umd.edu) and / or NARST Executive Director Bill Kyle (bill_kyle@umsl.edu). A letter of intention is **due by August 10, 2008** to Penny J. Gilmer, Search Chair, (gilmer@chem.fsu.edu) in which the rationale for seeking the position is described in detail.

The complete proposal for *JRST* Editor is **due September 12, 2008**. The proposal should be submitted to Penny J. Gilmer in a single Adobe document (.pdf) file. Finalists may be invited to attend a portion of the NARST Board of Directors meeting (October 17 to 19, 2008) 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.

Release date: 9 July 2008

All applications were sent to Gilmer, and then she distributed them to the committee members with the criteria upon which the committee had agreed. Each committee member sent her/his comments only to Gilmer, so each person would give her/his appraisal independently. Once all evaluations were submitted, Gilmer summarized 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 had a conference call and decided on a ranked list, and decided to ask our top choice to come to the NARST Fall Board meeting, so we could address issues that resulted from their application materials. The NARST Board approved the two nominees for *JRST* Editor.

Below are the criteria for the evaluation:

Criteria and Scoring for 2008 Scoring of Candidates for *JRST* Editorship

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 <i>JRST</i> , 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 B. Evidence/experience of working collaboratively/effectively with teams of people		
Total		

NARST Standing Committees

Program Committee

The Chair of the Program Committee is the NARST President. The Program Committee includes the President-elect, the Executive Director, and each of the Strand Coordinators (typically two per Strand, each with a staggered two-year term).

The charge of the Program Committee is to assist the President in planning and conducting the Annual International Conference.

NARST Annual International Conference

Procedures:

The roles and responsibilities of Strand Coordinators (SCs) are defined in this document. Please read the directions carefully before starting your work.

General Information on the Annual International Conference (taken from the directions for Strand Coordinators)

1. Advisory Nature of Strands

Final program decisions will be based on the advice and opinions of the Strand Coordinators. NARST's current policy is that the Program Committee Chair has the ultimate responsibility for the program as a whole. Considerations such as the number of meeting rooms available at the conference hotel and the room setup will influence the number of proposals that can be accepted altogether and the number of sessions that will be possible. The Program Committee Chair is responsible for ensuring that fairness has been achieved across Strands. Consequently, the Strand Coordinators' recommendations about acceptance/rejection of proposals and session formats are **only** advisory to the Program Committee Chair. In addition, the President (and not Strand Coordinators) will report all decisions about acceptance or rejection of proposal submissions. Thus, please direct any questions regarding the status of a proposal to the President.

2. Criteria to Be Used in Reviewing Proposals

Strand Coordinators and Assessors on each Strand team should be guided in their reviews by the criteria set out in the Call for Proposals. The Call for Proposals identifies the following criteria:

- a. *Subject/Problem.* Is there a clear focus, rationale, model, theory, or philosophy upon which the proposal is based?
- b. *Design or Procedure.* Are the methodology, procedure, design, and organization appropriate?
- c. *Analyses and Findings.* Do the syntheses of ideas or data analyses and findings appear to be appropriate and complete?
- d. *Contribution.* Do the conclusions contribute valuable insights into the teaching/learning of science?
- e. *General Interest.* Does the presentation promise to be of general interest to NARST members?

Finally, be sure that the individual papers for a related paper set comprise a cohesive and integrated set of consistent, high quality papers.

3. Limits on the Number of Presentations

The number of first author proposed presentations will be limited. The person to upload the proposal for submission for the NARST program is the first author. The rules are that an author may be:

1. First author on only one stand-alone paper *or* a paper within a related paper set,
2. First author on only one “interactive poster paper,”
3. Presenter in only one special symposium, and
4. Secondary author on any other stand-alone, related paper set, and/or interactive poster paper.

The on-line system will not allow a first author to make any more submissions than those that meet these guidelines. All papers (individual or paper sets) are identified with a P for the first part of the proposal number, and for related paper sets the letter code is R. So, individuals can be first author on either a P or R proposal. For posters the letter is a Q, and for special symposia an S. A person can be first author for one additional Q or S proposal.

The first author limitation applies only to member’s individually submitted proposals. Symposia, invited sessions, keynote speakers, and workshops sponsored by Strand Coordinators or Board Members are not limited by first author and do no impact a member’s ability to submit individual proposals in addition those they were invited to present at NARST.

4. Requirements for First Author

The first author of the paper or poster, or organizer of a symposium is the one to upload the proposal for submission for the NARST program. Note that all first authors need to present their paper or poster, and the first author needs to pre-register for the meeting by deadline announced. Otherwise, the submission will be deleted from the program.

5. Requirement of Manuscript Either on the *NARST Conference* CD or for Distribution at Conference

Note that authors presenting either a paper *or* a poster are required to have a manuscript for distribution, available either via the *NARST Conference* CD, which is made available to all conference attendees, or distributed at the paper or poster presentation.

6. Proposal (Synopsis) Format (Upload)

Adobe PDF is the only format that will be accepted for a proposal upload. Proposers can save a Microsoft Word file, for instance, in PDF by using the “Print” field and pressing the button, “Save as PDF,” being sure that the suffix at the end of the file name has “.pdf”.

For all proposal submissions, the first author will need to submit the abstract (maximum 200 words) into a textbox provided at the Web site. In addition, the first author submits one electronic abstract file for the proposal. This abstract will be used exactly as entered later in the program, if the paper is accepted.

The document should be single-spaced with 1” margins all around in font no smaller than 12 on US letter size. In the document, the reviewers should address the five criteria that are part of the review process: 1) subject/problem; 2) the design/procedure; 3) the findings and analysis; 4) the contribution to the teaching and learning of science; and 5) the contribution of the paper to the interests of NARST members.

Format for submission of proposal:

- ❖ For a *paper or poster* by individual authors or co-authors, there is a maximum of five pages (including references).
- ❖ For a *related paper set* by multiple author or co-author groups, each first author of a paper within the paper set submits an abstract and proposal for that paper, in a maximum of five pages per paper (including references).

- ❖ For a *special symposium* by multiple presenters, there is a maximum of 10 pages (including references). This should include a description of all the papers into one document (including the five features designated above) within the set and indicate the relationship of the findings to one another.

7. Invited Strand Sessions

Each pair of Strand Co-coordinators may (optional) recommend one invited Strand session (entitled Admin Symposium on the online submission Web page). Board members in some cases (e.g., Publications Committee) may have two invited sessions. These sessions do not go through the normal review process. Suggestions for invited sessions are **advisory** to the Program Chair, who is responsible for the overall balance of the Annual International Conference. You are encouraged to assemble a session and invite participants. Please make it clear to invited speakers, however, that the session is not confirmed at the time of your invitation. You will enter the Admin Symposium into the Web site. You will have a special section called “Strand Coordinator Task”. Under that section, there is a link called “Coordinator Abstract entry”, and this is where you upload the Strand invited session. These invited sessions will be scheduled as part of the regular program and will count toward your Strand’s total number of sessions for the conference. **You have until August 31st to enter an invited Admin Symposium or invited session.**

SPECIFIC COORDINATOR STEPS IN PROCESSING PROPOSALS

Soon after the August 15 proposal submission deadline, you should complete the following steps to process proposals:

Step 1. Checking that all proposals are complete, have the correct format, and have no indicators of names or institutions

NARST Headquarters sent an e-mail to each proposer with a confirmation # for their proposal(s). We improved the web site this year by requiring certain fields before the paper could be submitted. This should limit the number of incomplete proposals, which was a problem in previous years. However, this does not indicate that all parts of the proposal are in the system accurately. Therefore, please open all files in your Strand. Check that each submitted paper and poster in your Strand has the name of the presenter(s), the abstract and a PDF file with the paper and references (*no more than five pages*). With related paper sets, each paper within a set should have an abstract and a PDF of the paper and references (*no more than five pages*). Symposia should have the abstract and just one PDF file with a summary of the symposia and references (*no more than 10 pages*).

To check papers, you will see the section called “Strand Coordinator Tasks.” Under that section, there is a link entitled “Manage Proposals.” From this link, you will be directed to a page with all of the papers submitted to your Strand. The link provides the demographic information, abstract, download of the full file, and link called “Manage Assessor Review Assignment(s) for this Proposal” (this last link is described later in this document).

Also be sure that all proposals are in the proper format and that none has indicators of the person(s) submitting the proposal or the sponsoring institution. If you find this, you can e-mail the proposer(s) and ask them to replace the file (we will leave the Web site on only for proposals already in the system, to make such changes). This will save you time later if the proposal is assigned and then the reviewer mentions to you that there are identifiers within the proposal.

We have set the process this year that any files that have been started can be amended through August 22nd, but new people will not have access to starting a proposal after the morning of August 18th. You will be able to review current progress through the Web site.

During the week of August 18-23, please assign proposals for your assessors to review. Sometime after Monday, August 25th, we will send, via the management company, an e-mail message to all assessors explaining the process to complete the review of proposals.

Step 2. Redirecting Proposals and Checking for Proper Submission

Check whether you have received any proposal that you feel is more appropriate for another Strand - please notify the President with your suggestion to which Strand you propose for that proposal.

Step 3. Selecting Assessors

Two to three assessors should evaluate each proposal. We provided up to 5 assessor slots for each paper since we discovered last year that we sometimes needed to add a few more assessors if the first people do not respond to the task in a timely manner. As Strand Coordinator, you will choose your team of assessors. *Assessors must be NARST members.* When members registered at the NARST abstract page, they were asked to check a tick box if they were interested in serving as an assessor for your Strand. These volunteer's names will appear for you in the "Strand Coordinator tasks" section of the web site, where you will select them for your Strand (more information about this is forthcoming in this set of directions).

We also encourage you to solicit at least 20-30 assessors, well known in the field for your Strand, depending on the number of proposals you expect to get. It is imperative to get good assessors as they are the ones who give you advice on accepting or rejecting a proposal, and ultimately, this input guides the quality of proposals presented at the conference. Since approximately 20-30% of proposals come from international members, please seek some international members as assessors for your Strand. You can solicit assessors by contacting individual members, by sending an e-mail to the public NARST list at <http://www.narst.org/listserv.cfm>, or by sending a call through the all NARST members' list by sending the message to be distributed to Robin Turner at rturner@DROHANMGMT.COM.

As Strand Coordinator, you will not be able to add assessor names into the online system this year.

Instead, you will direct the potential assessor to the NARST Abstract page, where he/she will register and check the box for volunteering to be an assessor for interested Strands. This change from last year will not only save you time from having to type in people's information, but it is also designed to help us eliminate some problems we had last year with different people's spellings of names (e.g., Andy Anderson, Charles Anderson, C. Andy Anderson) and email addresses (e.g., a work related e-mail address and then a Yahoo personal e-mail address). The web pages are integrated this year so all steps (proposal submissions, reviews, assessor's assignments, etc.) are all working off of the same web page information. Thus, if Coordinators entered names on behalf of an assessor, there is a greater chance of multiple types of entries and therefore variation on names and e-mail addresses popping up in the system as though they were two different people. So, we figured if people entered their own names not only would it save the Strand Coordinators time, but also the information would be entered once (by the member). That should save us a lot of headaches when it comes to downloading the final spreadsheets and putting them into our scheduling program (which sorts by people's names).

Below is a copy of the number of proposals submitted for the 2008 conference for each Strand for the regular proposal submission (this did not include NARST board or committee-sponsored sessions). We recommend that you limit the number of proposals per assessor to three. For Strand 7, there were 92 total papers submitted for the 2008 conference, so with two assessors per paper, you would want probably at least 60 assessors available (but have extra names on hand because not every assessor does his/her job) so to spread out the number of proposals to assess. Other Strands would need fewer assessors.

NARST proposals submitted in 2007 for 2008 Annual International Conference

Strand #	Stand Alone Papers	Related Paper Sets	Total Papers in Related Paper Sets	Interactive Poster Papers	Special Symposia	Total papers/ Strand
1	71	3	13	12	2	98
2	64	3	13	15	5	97
3	18	1	5	9	1	33
4	48	3	9	11	0	68
5	41	0	0	8	2	51
6	31	1	4	14	1	50
7	63	2	9	16	2	90
8	49	3	14	16	1	80
9	7	1	1	3	0	11
10	33	2	9	11	4	57
11	34	2	9	6	5	54
12	21	1	4	3	0	28
13	36	1	1	11	2	50
14	21	1	4	4	0	29
TOTAL	507		78	130	21	736

This year, we added Strand 15, entitled *Policy*. The Policy Strand will address Policy and Practice issues: local, regional, national, or international issues of policy related to science education (e.g., teacher licensure requirements, curriculum adoption, assessment regulations, and funding policy for science education). Because it is a new Strand, we do not have a track record of proposals submitted to it.

To help you know whether assessors have volunteered to review for more than one Strand, we have added a process this year, which will help you know the number of Strands for which a member has volunteered. This may help you decide how many papers to give to each person. This is also the first step you must take to assign assessors who volunteered (either on their own via the Web site or through your solicitation) to your Strand. You will see the section called “Strand Coordinator tasks.” Under that section, there is a link called “Manage Assessor Assignments.” When you click on this link, you will see all of the names of people who have volunteered to serve as an assessor for your Strand (or other Strands in addition to yours). To select the assessors for your Strand, you must click on each person’s name and click the tick box for your Strand. You can always check later to see if other Strand Coordinators have also selected this assessor.

After you have completed this first step, you may now use the function entitled “Manage Proposals.” Under this section you will find the ID number, Strand, author and proposal title for all submissions to your Strand. Invited sessions for your Strand will also show up at the bottom of the page. For each individual paper, related paper set, poster or special symposium that is subjected to peer review, you will need to assign 2-3 (or more) assessors. This can be accomplished in one of two ways:

- a. You can click “manage assessor assignments” from the pink box (which will give you a listing of all assessors for your Strand). You click on the assessor’s names you want to assign to each paper, and click “save assignments.” Remember, names will not appear for you to choose from unless you complete the first step described in the previous paragraph.

- b. You can click on the title of the paper, which brings you to a page with the demographic information, abstract, download of the full file, and link called “Manage Assessor Review Assignment(s) for this Proposal.” Once you click on this link, you assign assessors in the same manner as described in option “a” above.

After all papers have been assigned assessors, we will send an e-mail message via the Drohan Management Company to all assessors with the URL Web access to the following:

- Abstract and proposal with identification code
- Cover letter (e-mail), which clearly indicates the due date (September 15th, 2008) by which the *assessors’ ratings must be submitted electronically on the NARST Web site* (this is the letter at the end of this document)
- Sample reviews that illustrates “accept” and “reject” reviews
- Link to the assessor-rating sheet for each proposal reviewed (and a place to submit)
- Link to the assessor summary-rating (and a place to submit their rating)

As a Strand Coordinator, you should act as an assessor yourself only if you need a tiebreaker or if one of your assessors does not respond in time. If you would like to start assigning proposals early to your assessors, this should be possible now. **The deadline for completed reviews is September 15th, but you should encourage your assessors to submit early.** You will be able to monitor the assessment process under the “manage proposals” section. As each assessor completes his/her review, the pink box will turn to green.

Strand Coordinators need to arrange for review of all proposals (other than your own invited symposia, if you submitted one) submitted to NARST in their Strand. Your Strand Co-coordinator may select assessors for any proposal you submitted to your own Strand.

Step 4. Resolving Disputes and Conflicts of Interest

Strand Coordinators should try to resolve disputes on their own (e.g., opposing opinions from the assessors) and send us a **final rating and recommendation** for each proposal. If assessors disagree, hopefully, you as the Strand Coordinator can use your own judgment to reach a decision. However, should you not be able to reach a decision, the particular case should be marked clearly and sent to the President for resolution. In addition, a potential conflict of interest could arise if the Strand Coordinator or a close colleague is an author or co-author of a proposal. In such cases, proposals should be sent to assessors in the normal way. Therefore, please take time to check if the institution at which the proposers work; this will help avoid potential conflicts of interest. However, after assessors have reviewed these proposals, you as Strand Coordinator should mark the proposal as involving a potential conflict of interest and forward to the President.

Step 5. Submitting Strand Decisions (September 30th)

Assessor comments will be made available to the first author of all proposals regardless of the decision to accept or reject a proposal. Although the Program Committee Co-Chairs will make final program decisions, they will utilize your advice about groupings and formats, so grouping the proposals and indicating the format information are critical. **Please submit your Strand Rating Summaries and your Grouping/format Recommendations to NARST Web site by September 30th.** It is vital that the **September 30th** deadline be observed so that we can post a draft version of the preliminary program on the NARST Web site in December. A cautionary note: please be sure to keep a copy of all materials as a back up as you post materials to the NARST Web site.

To submit your ratings, log into the NARST Abstract page. Go to the “Strand Coordinator task” section and click on the link entitled “Ratings Review Summary.” At this link, you will select your Strand and there you will find all the papers, along with the reviewer’s ratings and a column entitled “SC Recommendation.” You will use the “SC Recommendation” pull down menu to recommend that the paper is accepted or rejected. Because of variation among assessor’s rankings, is important to read all of

the reviews before making your accept/reject decisions. To view an assessor's written comments, go to the "Ratings Review Summary" link (under Strand Coordinator tasks). There, click on any paper title to view the abstract. On the abstract view page, beneath the abstract, there is a link to "Manage Assessor Review Assignments for this Proposal," a list of Assessors that have been assigned (if any), and then the Assessor's review status. If a review has been entered, you can click on the "Read Review" link. *Please note that NARST seeks only high quality research proposals. Last year approximately 75% of submitted proposals were accepted, so a higher acceptance rate would be unusual.*

Step 6. Submitting Recommended Groupings (September 30th)

After you have completed the process of accepting or rejecting proposals, you will be able to group individual papers and posters into sets for the conference program. To prepare yourself for entering the data into the Web site, we recommend that you enter all of your sessions on the form below titled, "Strand Coordinator's Recommended Groupings." You can do this ahead of time on your sheet and then enter the data into the Web site. In this way, you will avoid double booking some group or leaving out any proposal from a grouping. Once you have completed this task, the form will convey all necessary information regarding the structure of your Strand.

To make your groupings:

1. Go to "Recommended Groupings" under the "Strand Coordinator tasks" section. You will first select your stand, which will move you to the page where groupings are made for Individual Papers (P numbers) and Posters (Q numbers). Other accepted proposal formats (e.g., related paper sets, special symposia, or admin proposals) will show up at the bottom of the page since they count toward your Strand's total allowed number of papers, but since they do not need to be grouped you need not do anything with them.
2. To group the Individual Papers and Posters into recommended sessions for the conference, first use the pull down menu to select which format you will be entering groupings.
3. Then, give a session title you recommend for the grouping.
4. Select the papers you want to group together by using the Ctrl key (Apple Command key on a Mac) to highlight, from the listing of accepted proposals in the right column, each proposal to be grouped together.
5. Next, identify a presider for the set. A list of volunteers for presider can be found under the "Strand Volunteers" link.
6. Finally, click on the "submit" button to save the grouping.
7. Repeat until all papers and posters are grouped into sets, according to common themes.

Remember that you should attempt to honor the author's choice for the format, if possible, for instance papers in paper sets and posters in the poster session. You may need to put some stand-alone papers into poster sessions, as your Strand will only have a certain number of groupings you have for paper or symposia presentations. There is no distinction among the formats in terms of paper quality--all papers should be reviewed on their merit. You must notify any authors of such format changes as some may choose to withdraw their presentation instead of changing format.

Grouping Paper Sets

Your main task will be in grouping the individual papers into Strand coordinator-organized paper sets, making a title for each grouping, and adding presider for each grouping. For Strand Coordinator-organized paper sets, each paper in the paper set (generally four to five papers grouped around a common theme) has its own P# and title, so you need to enter them as a set. These sets will appear on the Recommended Groupings screen (right above the line where you add a new grouping) to show you they have already been accepted, grouped, and will take up a session slot for your Strand.

Grouping Posters

For Strand Coordinator-organized posters, each poster in the poster set (generally 8-12 papers grouped around a common theme) has its own Q# and title, so you need to group them as a set. You can select a

presider, who will make sure the room is set up for presenters and answer any questions. Presiders will **not** be asked to introduce posters prior to allowing participants to visit the posters. These sets will appear on the Recommended Groupings screen (right above the line where you add a new grouping) to show you they have already been accepted, grouped, and will take up a session slot for your Strand.

Please Note: When you submit your list of accepted proposals and groupings, you need to bear in mind that there will be session quotas for each Strand (set in relation to the number of proposals received). We will probably only have one time for all posters to be presented in the central part of the day, so that they are more prominent in the program and do not conflict with paper presentations. Once the President and President-elect know the number of proposals submitted, we will give you an idea of the number of sessions we can accommodate for your Strand. Thus, please watch for an e-mail message within the next week or so regarding your quota.

Step 7. Recognizing Assessors

Each assessor will receive a letter of thanks from the President-elect, and will be listed in the Annual International Conference program as an assessor. *We also recommend that you send a letter of appreciation to each of your assessors.*

Summary of Deadlines in Proposal Review Process

Date	Tasks
June 15	✓ Call for proposals.
Around August 15 th	✓ Solicit assessors for your Strand.
August 15	✓ Deadline for NARST proposals submitted to NARST Web site. The Web site will shut down; so new proposals may not be submitted after that time.
Around August 21 st	✓ Revisions to already prepared proposal submissions can take place directly on the Web site.
September 15	✓ Assessors post completed proposal ratings and documentation to NARST Web site.
September 30	✓ Strand Coordinators submit Rating Summaries and grouping/format/title recommendation to NARST Web site.

10. APPENDICES

Important Forms Attached (only so you can see what the Web page information looks like)

1. Assessor’s Letter
2. Assessor’s Rating Sheet
3. Ratings Summary Sheet
4. Strand Coordinator’s Recommended Groupings

Assessor's Letter

Date [25 August 2008]

Dear [Assessor's name]:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an Assessor 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://www.narst.org/abstracts09> and log in with your user name and password (the same one you used to register as an assessor or to submit a proposal). Link to "sample reviews" under "Assessor Tasks" to see examples of "accept" and "reject" reviews. Your goal is to provide high quality reviews such as the first one, which authors will find most helpful and informative.

Under "Assessor 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 "Assessor's Rating Sheet", illustrates for you the information you will need to enter to the Web site. Although you may want to type your reviews onto this sheet first, all ratings must be submitted on the NARST Web site. The Web site rating form requires you to rate all six categories of questions and provide written comments on at least your overall rating (the Web site will not accept rating sheets without this written comment). 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.

The Web site will notify you when your review has been posted. Additionally, next time you log into <http://www.narst.org/abstracts09>, you will see a comment that your review has already been completed. **Please post your completed rating forms on the NARST Web site 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 2009 NARST program in Garden Grove, CA. The authors of the proposals, the program committee, and the members of NARST thank you.

Sincerely,

Charlene M. Czerniak
NARST President
Professor
University of Toledo
charlene.czerniak@utoledo.edu

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 an assessor, 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.]

5 - 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.

4 - 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.

5 - 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.

Assessor's Rating Sheet for NARST Proposals

Strand Number: _____

Identification Code of Proposal: _____

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

Criteria	Description of criteria	Rating
1. Subject/Problem	Focus, rationale, model, theory and/or philosophy are clear. <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5
2. Design /Procedure	Methodology, procedure, design and/or organization are appropriate. <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5
3. Findings and Analysis	Syntheses of ideas or data analyses and findings appear to be appropriate and complete. <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5
4. Contribution	The conclusions contribute valuable insights into the teaching/learning of science. <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5
5. General Interest	The presentation promises to be of general interest to NARST members. <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5
6. Overall Rating	(1-not recommended; 5-highly recommended) <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5

Overall Recommendation:

Definitely Accept _____

Probably Accept _____

Reject _____

Ratings Summary Sheet for NARST Proposals

(for use by Strand Coordinators)

Strand Number: _____

Page _____ of _____

Proposal ID Code	Author	Title	Rating by Assessor 1	Rating by Assessor 2	Rating by Assessor 3	Rating by Assessor 4	Rating by Assessor 5	

International Committee

The membership consists of a Chair and nine members. The Chair is a Board Member elected by the members of NARST. The NARST President-elect appoints all other nine 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, the 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. The travel for the *Ex officio* member to attend the subsequent October Board Meeting will be paid by NARST.

Charge

The International Committee organizes various activities including, but not limited to, Committee sponsored seminars at the Annual International Conference and at biennial meetings of the European Science Education Research Association (ESERA) and the Australasian Science Education Research Association (ASERA), a mentor-mentee program, a scholarship program, and a Linking Science Educators Program (LSEP).

Procedures

The International Coordinator chairs the International Committee, organizes and supervises the international activities of NARST, subject to review by the Board of Directors, and makes a report to NARST at the Annual Business Meeting.

The International Committee hosts a symposium at each Annual International Conference.

The International Committee sponsors an ESERA Session at NARST Annual International Conference while ESERA sponsors a NARST Session at its conference. Similarly, we have a reciprocal agreement with ASERA, to sponsor one session with ASERA at our conference and we have a session at their conference in alternating years.

Documents and Sample Letters

NARST International Committee Scholarships

The NARST International Committee is enthusiastic to announce that there will be **fifteen** scholarships to support international members of NARST (e.g., graduate students and junior scholars) to attend the 2009 NARST conference during April 17-21, 2009 in Orange County, Garden Grove, CA. Detailed information and the application form for the scholarships are posted on the NARST Web site (<http://www.narst.org/annualconference/2009conference.cfm>). Application deadline for the scholarships is December 14.

NARST International Committee Scholarships

Purpose

The NARST international committee scholarships have been established for the following purposes:

1. To encourage international graduate students, international science education professionals just starting their careers in science education, and international science education researchers to participate in NARST Annual International Conference.
2. To demonstrate the commitment of NARST to help international graduate students, international science education professionals just starting their careers in science education, and international science education researchers to share their experiences and develop professionally.
3. To demonstrate the commitment of NARST of becoming an international organization by financially supporting international science educators to attend the NARST Annual International Conference.

What do the scholarships cover?

Scholarships are not meant to cover the full cost associated with attending the NARST conference. They are rather intended to defray some of the cost of attending the conference. The scholarships may be used for air travel, ground transportation, and conference registration fees.

Number of scholarships and scholarship amount

We plan to offer 15 scholarships at a maximum amount of \$700.00 per scholarship. The total amount of this proposal is \$10,500.

Who is eligible to get the scholarships?

The following groups of individuals are eligible to receive the NARST scholarships, in order of priority:

1. Members of NARST who are international science education graduate students studying outside the USA.
2. Members of NARST who are junior international science education scholars within six years since completion of their PhD and working outside the USA.

To be eligible for the scholarships, recipients must preferably be participating in the conference by presenting a paper, participating in a seminar, or conducting NARST official business such as serving on the NARST board or chairing a NARST committee. Moreover, applicants need to demonstrate a need for support and to provide evidence that they have attempted to get support from other sources to attend the conference. Finally, preference will be given to applicants from underrepresented groups, applicants from developing countries, and those who have not received

a scholarship in a previous year.

Scholarship application procedures:

Applicants should

1. Fill out the attached application form
2. Provide evidence for needing support

Please combine all materials into one word or PDF file and submit your document electronically to Mei-Hung Chiu, Chair of the International Committee, no later than December 14, 2008.

Selection process

The International Committee will decide scholarships by consensus based on the merit and need of applicants. Preference will be given to applicants who will present papers at the conference. In order to protect the anonymity and integrity of the selection process, the chair of the International Committee, who is not eligible to apply for the scholarships, will:

1. Solicit, collect, and blind the applications.
2. Not engage in the review of the candidates or cast votes for recipients, including in the case of a tie.
3. Remove those applications submitted by members of the international committee from reviewing their own applications.
4. Distribute and synthesize the recommendations of the committee.
5. Distribute and synthesize the recommendations of the Committee.
6. Report to the NARST Board of Directors and to the applicants regarding final awardees and alternates.

Application deadline for the scholarships is December 14.

Detailed information and the application form for the scholarships are posted on the NARST Web site (<http://www.narst.org/annualconference/2009conference.cfm>).

Selection decisions: January 31, 2009

Notification: Early February 2009

NARST 2009 International Committee Scholarships Application

Deadline: December 14, 2008

Last name: _____

First name: _____

Institution name: _____

Institution address: _____

Mailing address: _____

Telephone:

Email:

Fax

Current status:

___ International science education graduate student studying outside the USA.

___ International science education scholar within 6 years of completion of PhD and working outside the USA

Have you ever received a NARST International Committee scholarship?

___ **Yes** ___ **No**

If yes, what year did you receive the scholarship? _____

Estimated budget:

Travel: _____

Conference registration: _____

Lodging/meals: _____

Other: _____

Other funding (source and amount)

- Please provide a written statement (a maximum of 300 words) describing the nature of your participation in NARST Conference (Title of your presentation or seminar in which you will participate...). In addition, describe the benefits you expect to reap from participating in the conference
- Please provide a written statement (a maximum of 300 words) describing your attempts to get other funding, if any.
- Please provide your curriculum vita (a maximum of 2 pages) describing your educational and working experiences in science education.

- Please provide your proposal for NARST 2009 if it is accepted for presenting at the conference.
-

NARST International Committee Scholarship Application Review Form

APPLICANT:

SUMMARY TABLE

	EVALUATION CATEGORY	POINTS (MAX 3)	SCORES
1	Meeting Scholarship Requirements	3	
2	Contributing to International Community	3	
3	Contributing to Research areas	3	
4	Potential as a Scholar	3	
		TOTAL	

One point for each following criterion

Criterion #1: Meeting Scholarship Requirements

Applicant is an international member

Applicant is either a graduate of a Ph.D. program or currently enrolled.

Applicant is a CURRENT member of NARST

Points and Comments for Criterion #1

Criterion #2: Contributing to International Community

Applicant's study is relevant to international community

Applicant shows one's interest for improving science education

Applicant is active to participate in international activities

Points and Comments for Criterion #2

Criterion #3: Contributing to Research areas

Applicant's study shows the potential importance to research in science education

Applicant's study reveals relevance of conducting one's research

Applicant's study shows insights for research

Points and Comments for Criterion #3

Criterion #4: Potential as a scholar

Applicant shows strong motivation to be a researcher

Applicant shows strong competence in conducting science education research

Applicant has teaching and research experience and expertise.

Points and Comments for Criterion #4

General Comments

Linking Science Educators Program (LSEP)

International Committee

Call for Proposals

Description

NARST is a worldwide organization committed to help all learners to achieve scientific literacy as an ultimate goal and to cooperate with other educational and scientific societies to influence science education policies. The Linking Science Educators (LSEP) program, initiated by International Committee of NARST, is a new initiative designed to contribute to improvement of science educators 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 educational disadvantaged countries (e.g., low financial support towards science education with respect to their gross national product for education), but not limited to, who will implement new ideas on science educational reform in their countries. However, the program is also open to representative with science educational reform ideas but cannot attain enough financial support otherwise.

The LSEP program would support the economy round-trip airfare for resource persons (who

must be NARST members) while the host country would provide the cost for the resource person's stay and for expenses for the proposed activity (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.

LSEP program will act as a catalyst so NARST members may contribute their expertise and experiences in theory and in practice to people in different countries.

To qualify for a LSEP, the chairperson of a national science education association or other recognized body must submit an application to the NARST International Coordinator/International Committee Chair using the appended form.

Purpose

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

1. Bring science educators to countries, which are interested in improving science education, in particular, to economically disadvantaged or underrepresented countries for implementing new ideas in science education reform.
2. Encourage NARST members to contribute their expertise and experiences in theory and practice to different regions and countries.
3. Demonstrate the commitment of NARST to improving science education research in different cultures.
4. Share responsibilities for improving scientific literacy of global citizens in 21st century.
5. Promote active interaction among science education associations.

Who is eligible for this 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 that are associated with the improvement of science education.
2. LSEP program will act as a catalyst to encourage NARST members to contribute their expertise and experiences in theory and practice to different regions and countries.

What does the LSEP program cover?

The LSEP program would support round-trip economy airfare, local transportations, for the resource expert(s) (who must be NARST members) and copies of teaching materials for participants while the host country would provide the cost for the resource person's stay and for the conference/workshop/seminar, or other activity.

Translations of materials that will be used in the country activities, if needed, are the responsibility of the host country.

Budget anticipated

The maximum total amount of this proposal is \$5,000 per year.

Timeline

Submission deadlines: March 15, 2009

Starting and ending time: April 15, 2009-December, 31, 2009

Who are the resource experts?

NARST members are eligible and encouraged to contribute their experiences and expertise to the LSEP program. A list of resource experts to match the country's needs for the LSEP could be recommended by International Committee under request.

Procedures and requirements of application

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

1. Download descriptions of LSEP from www.narst.org, the official Web site of NARST.
2. Contact the International Coordinator of NARST, Mei-Hung Chiu at mhchiu@ntnu.edu.tw.
3. Search for potential resource persons who will agree to come.
4. Interact with the NARST International Coordinator/International Committee Chair for preparation of the proposal (Project submission form available: [http://www.narst.org/LSEP/ LSEP_applicationform.doc](http://www.narst.org/LSEP/LSEP_applicationform.doc))
5. Submit the proposal to the NARST International Coordinator/International Committee Chair via e-mail (Mei-Hung Chiu at mhchiu@ntnu.edu.tw), fax, or post-signed document on institutional letterhead to:
NARST
12100 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 130, Reston, VA USA 20190-3221
Phone: 703-234-4138 - Fax: 703-435-4390
6. Receive review comments from the NARST International Coordinator/International Committee Chair and make revisions for re-submission, if necessary.
7. Wait for the results of the final reviews to be announced.
8. If proposal is accepted, implement the proposed project.

Additional Requirements

9. Write a one-page description of the project and submit it to the NARST International Coordinator/International Committee Chair for *E-NARST News*. The International Coordinator will provide support in writing the report, if needed.
10. Write 5-10 page report (including photos of the event) after completing the project for the NARST and submit it to the NARST International Coordinator/International Committee Chair. The International Coordinator will provide support in writing the report, if needed. This report will be posted on the NARST Web site.

Selection Process

The International Committee will decide on those receiving the LSEP awards by consensus based on the need of applicants and strength of the proposal. 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 (Project review form available at http://www.narst.org/LSEP/LSEP_reviewform.doc), final nomination by NARST International Committee, and approval by the NARST Board of Directors.

The selection process will be as follows:

1. Distribute application documents for evaluation by the International Committee
2. Review and synthesize the recommendations of the Committee
3. Make decisions based upon the consensus of the Committee
4. Report to the NARST Board of Directors and to the applicants regarding final awardees

LSEP Project Submission Form

Linking Science Educators Program (LSEP)

This program is available to countries interested in improving science education with support from experts who are members of NARST. The chairpersons of science education association in these countries or other recognized bodies in the countries are eligible to submit project proposals.

The form should be completed with a word processor and returned to the Chair of the NARST International Coordinator (Mei-Hung Chiu: mhchiu@ntnu.edu.tw), preferably as an e-mail attachment. Please do not remove section headers and answer all questions; indicate NA when a question does not apply to the proposal.

APPLICANT

PART A

<i>for administrative use only</i>	
Date	
Project Title	
Time Frame	
Keywords	(at least 3 keywords)
Task Group Chairperson (has to be NARST member)	(including address and e-mail)
Task Group Members	(including address and e-mail)
Name of the person submitting this form <i>if not the proposed Task Group Chairperson</i>	(including address and e-mail)
Objectives	(<50 words)
General Description (including names and institutions of resource persons who have to be NARST members. If not, they have to register before conducting the project)	(suggest approx. 2 pages)
Duration	
Audience (who and how many)	

Place	
Type of LESP	(Conference, workshop, lecture, etc.)
Program agenda	
Outcome (please tick box)	Yes No
	Journal papers Book Workshop or conference proceeding Set of instructional materials Database Web page Newspaper Other:
Dissemination Plan	
Budget (Total from all sources)	
Travel Administrative (copies of materials) Local transportation Other (<i>describe</i>) Total (in USD)	
Requested from NARST	

External Funding Agency Applied to (if any)	
Anticipated Impact	
Criteria for Retrospective Evaluation	
Reference persons	

LSEP Reviewer Form

Applicant:

Country:

LSEP Type: (Conference/Workshop/Seminar) (choose one)

Summary Table

Review category

Points (Max 100 scores)

Scores

- 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:

- 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:

Scores

- 1. Applicant's status (10%)
 - (1) Applicant is a CURRENT member of NARST

(2) Applicant is the chair of science education association in his/her country

(3) Applicant shows strong competence in conducting LSEP

all fit well (7-10%) partially fit (3-6%) all NOT fit well (0-2%)

Comments _____

2. Meets LSEP Requirements (15%)

(1) An emergent need for improving science education quality (1-8%)

(2) Economically disadvantaged or underrepresented countries (1-7%)

Comments _____

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

(1) With the value of promoting science education (1-7%)

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

(3) Anticipated outcomes could be achieved (1-6%)

Comments _____

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

(1) Fulfill the mission in promoting quality of teaching and learning in science (1-10%)

(2) Fulfill the mission in communicating with researchers internationally (1-10%)

Comments _____

5. Contribution to Applicant's Country (25%)

(1) Fulfill the mission in promoting quality of teaching and learning in science (1-7%)

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

(3) Potential influence on changing science education policy (1-6%)

(4) Invite various types of participants to attend the activity (1-6%)

Comments _____

6. Qualification of Resource Persons (10%)

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

(2) Appropriateness to the anticipated activity (1-5%)

Comments _____

General Comments:

Publications Advisory Committee

The membership consists of a Chair (elected Board Member) and nine additional members appointed by the NARST President-elect with three rotating off each year. JRST Editor(s), Directors of other NARST publication efforts, along with the NSTA Research Director and the NARST President and Executive Director serve as Ex-officio members. The President-elect appoints a Board member to serve as Co-Chair during the last year of the Chair's tenure on the Board. The Co-chair will succeed to the Chair's position upon the Chair's retirement from the Board.

Committee Charge

The Publications Advisory Committee serves in an advisory capacity for all NARST-sponsored publications, including JRST, position papers, research-practice documents, and the NARST web site. The Chair is Editor for *E-NARST News*, a publication that is produced twice each year for NARST membership and serves as a historical document of the activities of the organization. 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. Finally, the PAC monitors and oversees changes to the NARST Web site's content.

Committee Activities

1. Publish *E-NARST News* twice each year (January and July).
2. Collaborate with the Research Committee and the External Policy and Relations Committee on the development of policy, as well as publications, such as position statements and research-practice documents.
3. Sponsor two sessions at the NARST Annual International Conference – one by the editors of JRST on publishing in the journal and the other to be determined by the committee.
4. Review the slate of nominees for JRST Editorial Board and Associate Editors, and make a motion for approval by the Board on the final version of the slate.

Procedures and Timeline

- During the summer the PAC discusses, agrees upon, and organizes the committee-sponsored session for the next NARST meeting. A proposal for this session, and for the JRST Editors session, is submitted at roughly the same time as other conference proposals in August.
- In the October and Spring (closely following the Board meetings), articles for *E-NARST News* are solicited from each of the NARST committees. The Chair works with the management company to edit together the document, which is reviewed by committee members. *E-NARST News* is published as a PDF to the Web site and organization members are notified via the listserv when new issues are released in January and July.
- In the Spring 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 Spring Board meeting to endorse the final version of the slate.

- The PAC collaborates in an ongoing way with members of other committees and with the NSTA Research Director to develop and publish documents that have broad appeal to multiple audiences, such as NARST membership, teachers, and policymakers.

***E-NARST News* Article Guidelines and Sample Timeline**

Articles from committees should not exceed 500 words. Please send 1-2 medium/high resolution images to accompany your article. Images should be sent as separate JPEG files as opposed to being embedded in the document text.

A sample timeline for Volume 52, Issue 2 of *E-NARST News*, published in July 2009, is offered:

- Call for articles: April 24, 2009
- Articles/letter to editor: May 29, 2009
- Text and layout to designer: June 8, 2009
- Draft to PAC and Board for review: June 19, 2009
- Feedback to designer: June 29, 2009
- Out to members and posted: July 6, 2009

The PAC invites you to download the publication from the NARST web site.

<http://www.narst.org/news/enarst.cfm>

Equity and Ethics Committee

The membership consists of a Chair and nine members. The Chair is a Board Member who is appointed by the NARST President-elect. The President-elect also appoints the nine other members with three members rotating out every year from their three years of service. The President-elect and Executive Director serve as *Ex-officio* members. The President-elect appoints a Board member to serve as Co-Chair during the last year of the Chair's tenure on the Board. The Co-Chair succeeds to the Chair position upon the Chair's retirement from the Board.

The Equity and Ethics Committee provides leadership and guidance to the organization on issues of equity and ethics including, but not limited to, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disabling conditions, sexual orientations, language, national origin and religion.

Procedures

- 1) Compile data, communicate results, and suggest recommendations to the Board related to equity in all areas of the organization.
- 2) Recommend or sponsor Strand Coordinators, reviewers, and keynote speakers for the Annual International Conference.
- 3) Promote the publication of periodic reviews of literature and conceptual or policy papers on equity issues.
- 4) Facilitate discussions among members about the organization's role in promoting equity within and outside the organization.
- 5) Contribute ideas related to equity issues for programmatic and publication related venues of the organization.
- 6) Promote research dealing with equity for all, especially underrepresented populations.

Timeline

Most of the business of the Equity Committee is conducted at the Annual International Conferences, with follow-up at Board meetings, and then by email as the need arises.

Call for Application for Jhumki Basu Scholarships

NARST Equity and Ethics Committee

Application Deadline: December 14

Purpose

As identified through its vision and mission to enhance broad and diverse membership, NARST offers scholarships for members from underrepresented groups within the United States (see Eligibility #2 below). The scholarships are designed to support promising young scholars from underrepresented groups to participate in NARST events and to contribute to science education research, scholarship, and leadership.

Scholarships

Fifteen scholarships in the amount of \$700 each are offered to support expenses to attend the NARST conference and the pre-conference workshop that will be offered by the NARST Equity and Ethics Committee. Scholarships will be given in the form of reimbursements for conference-related expenses, including air travel, lodging, and / or ground transportation. *Note:* Comparable scholarships are available to support members outside the U.S. through the NARST International Committee.

Eligibility

To be eligible for the scholarships, applicants should meet the following criteria:

1. A current membership in NARST.
2. NARST members from underrepresented groups, 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.”
3. Advanced-level doctoral students and junior scholars within 6 years of completion of their doctoral programs.
4. Residence in the U.S. at the time of their application.
5. Participation in the NARST Pre-conference Workshop to be offered by the Equity and Ethics Committee.

Note: Prior recipients of the NARST Jhumki Basu Scholarships are not eligible.

Application

Scholarships, along with the application form, are available on the NARST website: Applications for scholarships include: (a) the scholarship application form (see Appendix), (b) a 2-page vitae, and (c) a 2-4 page, double spaced statement on research interests.

Please combine all three application materials into one word or PDF file and submit your document electronically to the Chair of the Equity and Ethics Committee, no later than December 14th.

It is the responsibility of the applicant to make sure the application process is completed. The Chair will notify you of the receipt of your application electronically. Please keep this e-mail communication for your record.

Selection

The Equity and Ethics Committee will decide scholarships by consensus based on the merit and need of applicants. Selection will favor junior scholars 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 goals of NARST (see <http://narst.org>). These issues can be addressed in the 2-4 page statement on research interests. Additionally, preference will be given to applicants who will present papers at the NARST Annual International Conference.

To protect the anonymity and integrity of the selection process, the Chair 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 the case of a tie.
- Distribute and synthesize the recommendations of the Committee.
- Report to the NARST Board of Directors and to 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 committee and the selection process.

Jhumki Basu Scholarship Application Form

Submitted to the NARST Equity and Ethics Committee

Application Deadline: December 14, 2009

This form serves two purposes: (1) assessing your eligibility for the scholarship and (2) collecting contact details to keep you informed about the competition. For matters of the administration of NARST and the Equity and Ethics Board other details are collected as well, but completing is optional. Please complete the form by using a word processor.

1. Contact details

Last name:

Middle name(s):

First name:

Address and telephone numbers where you can be reached during the daytime hours.

Street:

City:

State:

County:

Zip:

Office phone:

Home phone:

E-mail:

2. Eligibility

Are you a member of NARST? Yes No

Are you a U.S. citizen or a permanent resident in the U.S? Yes No

Did you submit a paper(s) proposal to the 2010 NARST conference? Yes No

Title(s) of the paper(s) proposals you submitted:

1.

2.

3.

Year that you obtained (or will obtain) your doctoral degree:

Are you willing to participate in the NARST pre-conference workshop to be offered by the Equity and Ethics Committee? Yes No

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 a paragraph or two below.

3. Current institution and position:

Are you currently funded through a graduate assistantship, fellowship, or grant? Yes No

If yes, specify the amount and duration of the funding:

Will you get financial assistance to attend the 2009 NARST conference? Yes No

External Policy and Relations Committee

The membership consists of a Chair and nine members. The Chair is a Board Member who is appointed by the NARST President-elect. The President-elect also appoints the six members with two members rotating out every year from their three years of service. The President and Executive Director also act as *Ex-officio* members. Given the function of this committee, senior researchers, NARST Past-presidents, past and/or current presidents of other organizations, policy-makers, and high-ranking administrators who are also members of NARST should be considered first for membership on this committee. All other aspects of equity (gender, socio-cultural background, etc.) should also be considered in the selection of members. The President-elect appoints a Board member to serve as Co-Chair during the last year of the Chair's tenure on the Board. The Co-Chair succeeds to the Chair position upon the Chair's retirement from the Board.

Committee Charge

The External Policy and Relations Committee reviews existing and/or controversial educational policies at the state, national and international levels and works to inform NARST membership about these policies. This committee commissions position papers based on research. These position papers should be based on current and innovative findings and distributed through the Publications Advisory and Research Committees to the membership, policymakers, and the community-at-large. Note that these position papers may not necessarily reflect a unified position for NARST, but they are meant instead to add information from various perspectives of science education research. These papers would assist policymakers and the public-at-large to make more informed decisions. This committee fosters the development of partnerships and collaborations with appropriate professional organizations and groups concerned with the quality of science teaching and learning.

Committee Activities

1. Foster the development of official NARST affiliations with other organizations;
2. Support NARST's meaningful collaboration on policy and research fronts with other organizations, toward the goal of impacting policy and supporting research;
3. Support NARST's visibility at NSTA, for example through organizing and staffing a booth at NSTA;
4. Collaborate with the Publications Committee and the Research Committee on the development and dissemination of research to a broader audience;

5. Identify and pursue opportunities for NARST to impact policy related to science education.

Procedures and Timeline

1. EPRC members work with the Management Company to reserve NARST booth at NSTA and to obtain materials for the booth in October. EPRC members find NARST members willing to staff the booth in January. EPRC members identify *JRST* articles to make available at the booth in January. EPRC members set up and take down the booth at the NSTA conference.
2. EPRC members work with the EPRC Chair and the NARST board to develop Affiliations (through writing memorandums of understanding with potential Affiliates, communicating with the potential Affiliate's leadership, pursuing the completion of paperwork, etc.). EPRC members work to identify meaningful connections between NARST and the Affiliate organization(s), as appropriate for the type of Affiliation. This work is ongoing as needed. Once Affiliations are developed, EPRC members review affiliations on a regular basis.
3. EPRC members identify and pursue opportunities for NARST to impact policy related to science education, on an ongoing basis.
4. EPRC members work with others, on an ongoing basis, to foster the development and dissemination of documents that can affect policy and make research more broadly accessible (e.g., position papers).

Research Committee

Membership consists of a Chair and nine members. A Board Member appointed by the NARST President-elect, serves as Chair. The NARST President-elect also appoints all other nine members with three members rotating out every year from their three years of service. The President, the Executive Director and the NSTA Research Director act as *Ex-officio* members. The President-elect appoints a Board member to serve as Co-Chair during the last year of the Chair's tenure on the Board. The Co-Chair succeeds to the Chair position upon the Chair's retirement from the Board. The President-elect appoints a NARST Liaison to NSTA every third year. The NSTA Liaison acts as an *Ex-officio* member of the NARST Board and the Research Committee. The person in this position will represent NARST on the NSTA Committee on Research in Science Education and as a part of the Alliance of Affiliates.

Charge

The Research Committee develops, organizes and/or implements various professional development activities for the NARST membership, including special research topic pre-sessions at the Annual International Conference and research reviews and research-oriented documents specifically designed for internal use and member benefit; conceptualizes, develops, and disseminates reviews of research and white papers on appropriate topics; and supports the work of the NSTA Liaison. The NSTA Liaison is responsible for coordinating NARST sponsored sessions at NSTA conventions. The Research Committee will support this work by helping to review and select presentations.

Activities

1. The evaluation and selection of proposals for NARST Pre-Conference Workshops;
2. The evaluation and selection of proposals for NARST-sponsored sessions at the national and regional NSTA conferences;
3. Revision of research areas including in NARST Membership form;
4. The support of commissioned papers on timely and important research topics;
5. New ideas for increasing the visibility of NARST research.
6. The evaluation and selection of proposals for hosting the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students (the Abell Institute)

Procedures and Timeline

1. NSTA representatives will request that the NARST-NSTA Liaison provide names, titles and abstracts for two hours of programming at each of the three NSTA Annual Regional Conferences. This communication will take place in December or January and NARST submissions are due in February. The NSTA Regional Conferences will take place in the fall of the same calendar year.
2. NSTA representatives will request that the NARST-NSTA Liaison provide names, titles and abstracts for ten hours of conference programming at the NSTA Annual National Conference. This communication will take place in early spring of the year preceding the conference. NARST submissions are due in May (for the next year's conference that will take place in March or April).
3. The call for pre-conference workshops goes out in mid-summer for the following Spring international conference. Research Committee members review proposals and return results in September. (The

Chair may want to send thank you letters to workshop presenters following the annual conference.)

4. Categories of research interest for the membership form are reviewed and updated by Research Committee members every few years.
5. On a regular basis, research papers are commissioned as one means of disseminating NARST-related research to wider and more varied audiences.
6. Research Committee regularly reviews new mechanisms of producing press releases, developing web pages, sponsoring workshops or other events related to the increased visibility and understanding of NARST-related research.
7. NARST sponsors the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students every other summer. The chart below outlines a two-year timeline for this initiative.
8. The NARST-NSTA Liaison meets with the AOA at the NSTA National Congress for Science Education held each year in July. AOA representatives also participate in conference calls that take place monthly or every two months. Four of the eight AOA representatives are elected by the AOA to serve on a leadership council. The AOA Leadership Council participates in the annual NSTA winter board meeting held in February.

Timing	Activity
Yr 1 Summer	Committee solicits and reviews proposals to host the Abell Institute.
Yr 1 Fall	Committee recommends a host proposal to the Board. Board makes funding decision. If selected, the host team begins recruitment of participants.
Yr 1 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 committee. Committee forwards reports to the Board.
Yr 2 Spring	Committee and host team may collaborate on a culminating activity for the Abell Institute participants at the NARST Annual Conference (e.g. poster session).

Committee Organization

In order to facilitate work of the committee, the Chair may consider appointing committee members to take leadership roles associated with committee tasks and activities. The following roles have been assigned to committee members:

- Coordinator of preconference workshop proposal solicitation and review
- Conference site coordinator for preconference workshops (The Chair will likely be participating board activities while the workshops are being conducted. It is useful to have someone available to help coordinate on-site logistics and deal with potential problems.)
- Coordinator for NARST sponsored NSTA regional conference presentations
- Coordinator for NARST sponsored NSTA national conference presentations
- Coordinator of Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students proposal solicitation and review
- Coordinator of Research Committee sponsored conference sessions

Committee Resources

- 1) Call for Preconference Workshop Proposals
- 2) Preconference Workshop Proposal Review Sheet
- 3) Preconference Workshop Acceptance Letter
- 4) Preconference Workshop Declination Letter
- 5) Solicitation Guidelines for NARST Sponsored Presentations for the NSTA National Conference
- 6) Solicitation letter for NARST sponsored presentations at NSTA Regional Conferences
- 7) Supplemental Proposal Information for NARST Sponsored Sessions at NSTA Regional Meetings
- 8) Request for Proposals to Host the 20XX NARST Summer Research Institute for Doctoral Researchers
- 9) Review Rubric for Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students Proposals

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. Short description of relevant areas of expertise for each workshop facilitator
3. Workshop abstract (for recruiting participants)
4. 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 can take away from the workshop.

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:** 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.

Please submit proposals electronically (to XXXXX) in order to expedite the review process by members of the Research Committee.

Please direct all additional questions or inquiries to:

20XX NARST Pre-Conference Review Sheet

Rater:

Proposal Author(s):	
Proposal Title:	
Criteria	Rating: 1-5 (1 is low; 5 is high)
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.	
Total	
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
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 20XX 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 XXXXX, XX.

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.

The Research Committee will use the criteria below 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 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
XXXXXX

Supplemental Proposal Information for 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:
XXXXXX (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.

Request for Proposals to Host the 20XX 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 \$25,000 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 \$25,000 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

(XXXXXX, 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	

Membership and Elections Committee

Charge of the Committee

The Membership and Elections Committee (M&E) recruits members to NARST and ensures that the organization is responsive to the ongoing needs of the membership. The M&E Committee seeks new members from a variety of backgrounds and retains active members by soliciting interest in committee membership throughout the organization as well as in being considered for elected offices. In addition to developing a recommended slate for annual elections, the Committee's concern includes recruitment, retention, and responsiveness of the organization to members' interests.

The Committee organizes nomination, ranking and rating of potential candidates for the following NARST offices: (1) President-elect; (2) Board members at large; and (3) International Coordinator in order to develop a recommended slate of candidates for these offices to be approved by the NARST Board. Criteria for nomination, rating, and ranking include: (a) the candidates' research records, (b) their contributions to NARST to date, and (c) their expected contributions to NARST serving in the mentioned offices. In addition, the slate sent to the Board should reflect the diversity of the membership.

The Committee consists of nine members (three members rotating out every year from their three years of service), with the Immediate Past-president and an elected Board member (appointed by the President-elect) serving as Co-Chairs and the Executive Director serving as an *ex-officio* member. The M&E Committee members represent the diversity of the membership and their interests as a whole. The President-elect appoints a Board member to serve as Co-Chair during the last year of the Committee

Chair's tenure on the Board. The Co-Chair succeeds to the Chair position upon the Chair's retirement from the Board.

One representative from the International Committee and one representative from the Equity and Ethics Committee will be appointed by each committee from their respective committee members to serve as advisors to the Membership and Elections Committee. Each appointed individual must have already served at least one year on his or her committee (E&E or International). These representatives will assist the M&E Committee in addressing any questions or concerns regarding the diversity of the persons to be included in the recommended slate of candidates. Each appointed individual will serve a one year advisory term with the M&E Committee, although each may be selected for multiple terms if his or her committee so chooses. The E&E representative and International Committee representative may submit nominations of potential candidates for Board of Directors, International Coordinator, and President-elect following the petition process as described in "Nominations from the general NARST membership."*

*Approved by the Board at the April 2011 Board Meeting.

The Committee is responsible for recommending membership categories to the Board and for reviewing and recommending annual membership dues. The following membership categories are approved by the Board*:

Regular Membership

- Regular with JRST (\$120.00)
- Regular e-JRST only (\$110.00)

UNDP Membership

- UNDP HDI .800 and below countries with JRST (\$50.00)
- UNDP HDI .800 and below countries with e-JRST only (\$40.00)

Student Membership

- Student with JRST (\$55.00)
- Student with e-JRST only (\$45.00)
- Student without JRST (\$15.00)

Non-collegiate Educator Membership

- Non-collegiate Educator with JRST (\$55.00)
- Non-collegiate Educator with e-JRST only (\$45.00)
- Non-collegiate Educator without JRST (\$15.00)

Emeritus Membership

- Emeritus with JRST (\$55.00)
- Emeritus with e-JRST only (\$45.00)
- Emeritus without JRST (*no charge*)

* The membership categories above were approved by the Board at the October 2010 Board Meeting. A new membership dues structure was also approved by the Board. In addition, the Board agreed to review the membership dues at the October Board Meeting at least every 3 years, with the option of reviewing the dues structure during the budgeting process at any October Board Meeting.

An individual requesting to become an Emeritus member should craft a letter to the Executive Director and current President, in which s/he notes the desire to become an Emeritus member and also includes in the letter the date of full retirement. The individual will receive a letter back from NARST, signed by the Executive Director and current President, offering congratulations on retirement and encouraging continued participation in NARST for years to come. In the conference program each year, new Emeritus members will be noted with a *. [The change to the P&P regarding the process for becoming an Emeritus member was approved at the March 2010 Board Meeting.]

The major means of dealing with membership issues are:

1. Compile data, communicate results, and suggest recommendations relating to the business of the Association based on survey of the membership.
2. Recommend or sponsor sessions at the NARST Annual International Conference.
3. Coordinate a Mentor/Mentee program at the NARST Annual International Conference.
4. Publicize NARST and the Annual International Conference.

Procedure for Nominating and Rating Candidates for President-elect, Board Members at large, and International Coordinator

The following paragraphs of the NARST Bylaws (Approval by NARST Membership October 2008) apply:

Article III: Governance and Responsibilities

Section 4: Eligibility for Service on Board

Only NARST members are eligible to be nominated for elected office and to serve on the Board. An elected member may serve only one term in the same office on the Board.

A nominee for President-elect must have served previously on the Board OR been a member of the Association for a minimum of ten years. A candidate who has not served on the Board, but who has been a member of the Association for a minimum of 10 years, must have the President-elect nomination endorsed by at least 10 members of the current Board.

Section 5: Nomination – Election to the Board and Terms of Office

The Membership and Election Committee proposes to the Board a slate of two or more nominees for each vacant office. Association members may offer nominations to the Membership and Election Committee by forwarding a petition to the Executive Director; each petition must be endorsed by 10 Association members.

Step 1: Call for Nominations

Nominations from M&E Committee members:

Immediately after the NARST conference, the Co-Chairs of the M&E Committee (hereinafter called the Chairs) ask the members of the M&E Committee to nominate potential candidates for President-elect, Board of Directors, and the International Coordinator. To submit a nomination for any open position, the M&E Committee member must submit a nomination packet consisting of:

- (a) A letter of nomination describing the nominee's experiences and qualifications for the position. If nominating for a position on the Board of Directors, the statement should address the nominee's qualifications for one or more of the open committee chair positions.
- (b) A brief statement (of some 300 words), *prepared by the nominee*, describing the focus of the nominee's research, the nominee's affiliation with NARST to date and how the nominee envisions contributing to NARST as President-elect, a Board member, or International Coordinator. Nominees for positions on the Board of Directors are also asked to address their qualifications for one or more of the open committee chair positions.
- (c) A curriculum vita (*provided by the nominee*): Nominees for President-elect are asked to send a current cv. Nominees for positions on the Board of Directors and for International Coordinator are asked to send a two-page cv that includes their education, scholarship record, relevant experience and participation in local, national, and international organizations.
- (d) With respect to the office of President-elect, the nomination of a member who has not served on the NARST Board must contain written endorsements from 10 current Board members (as required by NARST Bylaws, Article III, Section 4).

Nominations of potential candidates from the M&E Committee members must be submitted directly to the M&E Chair by the due date. Nominees who do not have fully completed nomination packets by the due date will not be considered by the Committee.

Nominations from the general NARST membership:

The Chairs also send a message to the NARST membership requesting nominations of potential candidates for the open positions by the above petition procedure (Bylaws, Article III, Sections 4 and 5). To submit a nomination for the Board of Directors, International Coordinator, or President-elect, the person making the nomination must submit a nomination packet consisting of:

- (a) A letter of nomination describing the nominee's experiences and qualifications for the position. If nominating for a position on the Board of Directors, the statement should address the nominee's qualifications for one or more of the open committee chair positions.
- (b) A brief statement (of some 300 words), *prepared by the nominee*, describing the focus of the nominee's research, the nominee's affiliation with NARST to date and how the nominee envisions contributing to NARST as President-elect, a Board member, or International Coordinator. Nominees for positions on the Board of Directors are also asked to address their qualifications for one or more of the open committee chair positions.
- (c) A curriculum vita (*provided by the nominee*): Nominees for President-elect are asked to send a current cv. Nominees for positions on the Board of Directors and International Coordinator are asked to send a two-page cv that includes their education, scholarship record, relevant experience and participation in local, national, and international organizations.

(d) Nomination packets must contain additional, written endorsements from 10 NARST members (as required by NARST Bylaws, Article III, Section 5); with respect to the office of President-elect, the nomination of a member who has not served on the NARST Board must also contain written endorsements from 10 current Board members (as required by NARST Bylaws, Article III, Section 4).

Nominations of potential candidates from the NARST membership must be submitted to the Executive Director within three weeks of the announcement.

Only fully completed nomination packets will be sent by the Executive Director to the M&E Committee Chairs. Nominees whose nomination packets are not completed by the due date will not be considered by the Committee.

Step 2: Contacting the Nominated Colleagues

All potential candidates must be contacted by the person submitting the nomination in order to collect the nominee's required written statement and cv. After all fully completed nomination packets have been received and forwarded to the Chairs; the Chairs contact the colleagues who are nominated for positions on the Board and for International Coordinator. Nominees for Board member are informed of the open committee chair positions. The Chairs ask the potential candidates to confirm their willingness to serve if elected. The Immediate Past-President contacts nominees for President-elect to address any questions they might have about the position and to confirm their willingness to serve if elected.

All nominees are asked to confirm that they are current members of NARST in good standing. The nominees are advised to immediately inform the Chairs if at any point in the nomination and election process they are no longer able, or no longer wish, to serve in the particular office for which they are under consideration.

Step 3: Rating

The Chairs send the nomination packets to all M&E Committee members, each of whom rates each nominee based on the rubric set forth below. The members of the M&E Committee submit their ratings to the Chairs within three weeks of receiving the nomination packets.

The three criteria for the rating are the following.

(a) The nominee's research record

The nominee's scholarship as indicated by common indicators including publications, citations by colleagues, research funds raised, positions achieved, and awards received should be evaluated here.

(b) The nominee's contribution to NARST

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

(c) The nominee's expected contribution as NARST President, NARST Board Member or International Coordinator

For nominees for positions on the Board, the Committee should consider:

- i. how the nominee's ideas, visions, and leadership experience will advance the mission of NARST;

- ii. how the nominee demonstrates skills required to fruitfully collaborate with the other Board members and committee members; and
- iii. the diversity of NARST membership and whether this nominee would contribute to the Board reflecting that diversity.

For nominees for President-elect, the Committee should consider:

- i. how the nominee's ideas, visions, and leadership experience will advance the mission of NARST;
- ii. how the nominee demonstrates skills required to fruitfully collaborate with Board members, the Presidential team, and committee members; and
- iii. the nominee's facilities and abilities to organize the large-scale annual NARST International Conference.

For the International Coordinator additional criteria are applied:

- i. The nominee must have familiarity with the current status and future development of international science education research.
- ii. The nominee can be a member from any country (including the US)

For each of the three criteria the following scale is used: 3 (excellent), 2 (very good), 1 (acceptable), 0 (unacceptable). The final score of each Committee member's rating of each potential candidate is the sum of the scores achieved for the above three criteria (a), (b) and (c).

Step 4: Evaluation of the Ratings

The Chairs total each Committee member's rating of each potential candidate and then provide the confidential totals to the Committee. Following discussion by the Committee, the Chairs then select at least two recommended candidates for each open Board position, at least two recommended candidates for International Coordinator (when up for election), and at least two recommended candidates for President-elect. The Chairs have the option of selecting more than two recommended candidates for any position.

A confidential ranked order list of all nominees for all offices and the Chairs' proposed final slate of recommended candidates is sent by the Chairs to the members of the M&E Committee for approval; upon conclusion of the Committee's nomination process, all Committee members will be asked to destroy all copies of the confidential list. The members have two weeks to respond with their approval or disapproval. If the M&E Committee cannot come to agreement on the final recommended slate, the Chairs decide on the final recommended slate of candidates to be sent to the NARST Board. Before the final slate goes to the Board for approval, the Past-president shall obtain a final commitment from the recommended candidates for President-elect that they are indeed willing to serve if elected. The Chairs of the M&E committee likewise get final commitment from the recommended candidates for Board of Director and International Coordinator.

Step 5: Approval by the Board

The slate of recommended candidates is presented to the Board for approval. If the Board does not approve the slate, the Chairs and the Past-president revise the list and send the revised list to the members of the M&E Committee for approval. Once Committee approval of a revised recommended slate of

candidates is obtained, the revised slate is submitted to the Board for its approval. This process is repeated until the Board approves a slate of candidates.

Step 6: Informing the Final Candidates

The Executive Director contacts the candidates on the approved slate and requests that they send a final position statement of 200 to 250 words and a digital photograph that will appear with the election ballot. These materials should be sent to the Executive Director. The Executive Director informs those potential candidates whose nominations were considered by the M&E Committee but who were not selected for the final slate that they will not be on the ballot. After the election, the Executive Director 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 M&E Committee ratings.

*Approved by the Board at the April 2011 Board Meeting.

Election of NSTA Research Division Director

During years when NSTA is electing a new Research Division Director, the NARST M & E Committee also sends names of one to two NARST members to the NSTA Nominations Committee to stand for election as NSTA Research Director (historically this person also sits on the NARST Board in ex officio status). The Chairs send a call for nominations to the membership via the listserv and also requests nominations from the M & E Committee. The M & E Committee members vote on the nominees. The Chairs of the NARST Election Committee send the final nominees to the chair of the NSTA Nominations Committee by mid-September. The NARST President writes a letter of support for the nominee(s) before the Oct. 1 NSTA nominations deadline.

Documents and Sample Letters for Membership and Elections Committee

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:

- ___ 1. Science Learning, Understanding and Conceptual Change
- ___ 2. Science Learning: Contexts, Characteristics, and Interactions
- ___ 3. Science Teaching—Primary School (Grades preK-6)
- ___ 4. Science Teaching—Middle and High School (Grades 5-12)
- ___ 5. College Science Teaching and Learning (Grades 13-20)
- ___ 6. Science Learning in Informal Contexts Cultural, Social, and Gender Issues
- ___ 7. Preservice Science Teacher Education
- ___ 8. In-service Science Teacher Education
- ___ 9. Reflective Practice
- ___ 10. Curriculum, Evaluation, and Assessment
- ___ 11. Cultural, Social and Gender Issues
- ___ 12. Educational Technology
- ___ 13. History, Philosophy and Sociology of Science
- ___ 14. Environmental Education
- ___ 15. 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,

XXXXX, Chair, Membership Committee

Letter #1: Offer to be on the slate for the Board of Directors

Name and address of candidate

Dear,

On behalf of the Membership and 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 six candidates and three persons will be elected to the Board. The open positions on the Board are XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX.

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 chair committees and take a leadership role in the Association.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Chair

Letter #2: Sent to candidates by Past-President after the October Board meeting

Name and address of candidate

Dear (Board of Directors Candidate):

At its October meeting, the NARST Board of Directors approved the slate of officers proposed by the Membership and 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 a copy of last year's statements for your perusal. The Executive Director (include email address) should receive an electronic version of your statement and photograph no later than 15 November.

The April 20XX Board Meeting has been scheduled for XXX and XXX. If elected, you will be expected to attend these meetings, so please plan accordingly.

The Board also meets once on the third weekend of October; that meeting is scheduled for XXX. The attached list of Board Member responsibilities should help you understand the expectations, should you be elected.

Thanks again for agreeing to stand for election.

Sincerely,

Chair

Enclosure: Board Member Responsibilities

Board Member Responsibilities

1. Attend and participate in Board meetings

- Attend entire Board meeting—October (third weekend in October) and Spring (two sessions, one prior to the Annual International Conference and one following the Annual International Conference). NOTE: New Board members are expected 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
 - Respond to email conferences and votes
 - Attend NARST Awards Luncheon and Business Meeting, at the Annual International Conference.
2. Chair Committees
- Chair one or more NARST Standing Committees
 - Set agendas for and oversee committee meetings at Annual International Conference
 - Meet with committee via email as needed throughout the year
 - Delegate committee work to members
 - Ensure that committee work is completed and deadlines met
 - Keep committee members informed of meetings, Board decisions, etc.
 - Write committee reports for fall and spring Board meeting books
 - Propose discussion items and motions based on committee meetings at the Board meeting
3. *Ad hoc* Committee
- Chair or serve on ad hoc committees as requested by the President (examples include JRST Editor Search Committee; Executive Director search committee)
4. 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

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). During this meeting your role will be as guest and observer. You are welcome to participate in the discussion but cannot yet make, second, or vote on motions.
2. Attend committee meetings for any committee(s) you are assigned to chair. 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 Luncheon (seated at one of the reserved tables) and the Business Meeting
4. Attend the second Board meeting on XXXX from XXXX (breakfast and lunch provided). You will have full voting rights at this meeting and will be asked to present a brief summary from your committee meetings.

I have attached the NARST mission statement, bylaws, and current procedures manual for your information.

Congratulations again, and see you in xxx!

Sincerely,

NARST Executive Director

Attached: Board Member Responsibilities

NARST Mission Statement

Letter #4: Sent by Executive Director to unsuccessful candidates to the Board

Dear "name"

The NARST election results have been tallied, and I am very sorry to inform you that your nomination 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 XXXXXX. Best wishes for continued success in your science education research, teaching, and service efforts.

Sincerely,

Executive Director

Letter #5: Offer to be on the slate for President-elect

Name and address of applicant

Dear,

On behalf of the Membership and 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 Membership and Elections Committee believes that you would be an ideal candidate for this position.

Thank you for your consideration.

Past President

Letter #6: Approval to be on the slate for President-elect

Name and address of applicant

Dear (Presidential Candidate):

At its October meeting, the NARST Board of Directors approved the slate of officers proposed by the Membership and Elections Committee. Now it is official - you are a candidate for the NARST President.

As a presidential candidate, you have the opportunity to place a statement in the ballot that will help NARST members make informed choices in the election. I have attached a copy of last year's statements

for your perusal. Please send the Executive Director, Bill Kyle, the text of your statement no later than 15 November.

The April 20XX Board Meeting has been scheduled for XXX and XXX. If elected, you will be expected to attend these meetings, so please plan accordingly.

Thanks again for agreeing to stand for election.

Sincerely,

Name

Chair

Awards Committee

The membership consists of a Chair (and Co-Chair) and two members from the Award Selection Committees for each award (normally the Chair and Co-Chair).

Charge

The Awards Committee will:

- Oversee the work of the Award Selection Committees that solicits nominations and selects recipients for each of the NARST awards.
- Discuss issues related to equity and efficiency in the selection process, and the appropriateness of the award considering the NARST mission.
- If necessary, recommend changes in awards or procedures to the Board of Directors.

Membership/Term of Service

The membership consists of a Chair and Co-Chair and two members from each Award Selection Committee (normally the Chair and Co-Chair). The Chair is a Board Member who is appointed by the NARST President-elect. The President-elect appoints a Board member to serve as Co-Chair during the last year of the Chair's tenure on the Board. The Co-Chair succeeds to the Chair position upon the Chair's retirement from the Board. The NARST President-elect, in consultation with the Chair of the Awards Committee, also appoints other members. One member will serve as Co-chair of each of the five Award Selection Committees. Awards Committee chairs, similar to Strand Coordinators, will serve two-year terms with a year of overlap. Thus one new committee member for each award will be appointed every year.

Committee members serve for three years, with 1/3 of the new members being appointed and 1/3 rotating off each year. The total number of members of each Awards Selection Committee (including the Chair and Co-Chair of each committee in their year of appointment) is the following:

NARST Outstanding Paper Award Selection Committee	21
Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee	15
JRST Award Selection Committee	27
Early Career Research Award Selection Committee	12

Procedure for Changing Award Selection Committee Procedures

Award Selection Committees operate according to current procedures as specified in the *NARST Procedures and Policy Manual*. However, the members or chairs of an Award Selection Committee or members or chairs of the NARST Awards Committee could initiate requests for changes in procedures. In the event that the leadership and members of an Award Selection Committee or the Awards Committee decide for justifiable reasons (such as improving diversity of nominees, making the review criteria more comprehensive, or clarifying eligibility criteria) that a change in procedures of a given Award Selection Committee is warranted, the following procedure should be followed:

- 1) The proposed changes should be thoroughly discussed and receive a majority vote at the level of the Award Selection Committee before they proceed to the next level.
- 2) Approved changes at the Award Selection Committee level will be brought as an approved motion from the Committee Chair to the Chair of the Awards Committee who will bring the proposal before the Awards Committee for discussion and subsequent vote.
- 3) At this point, the NARST Awards Committee Chair will inform the NARST President, Past-President, and President-elect, about the nature of the proposed changes and invite them to share any comments/reservations they may have with the Awards Committee.
- 4) After ample discussion and consideration, the Awards Committee members will vote on the proposed procedures. In order to pass, the proposal will have to be approved by a majority vote.
- 5) If the NARST Presidents disagree with the outcome of the vote, they can bring the issue immediately to the attention of the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors can direct the Awards Committee Chair to further action, but cannot repeal the procedural change unless a motion is presented to the Board to that effect and unless the motion passes by a majority vote (using agreed-upon electronic voting procedures).
- 6) Approved changes in procedures that cannot be accommodated in the year in which they were proposed will become effective the following year. Decision about accommodation is judged by the nature of the proposed change and whether they fit within the timeline of the affected Award Selection Committee.
- 7) The Board of Directors is routinely informed about major procedural changes in Award Selection Committees in the semi-annual reports of the Awards Committee.

Procedure for Changing Awards

In cases where the Awards Committee, based on a majority vote, recommends a change in the awards proper (such as adding or deleting an award), this change will be subject to approval by a majority vote by the Board of Directors.

Code of Conduct

1. Confidentiality

All nominees and information about their work is to be kept in strictest confidence. Award Committee members must not copy, quote, or otherwise use or disclose to anyone, any material from any nomination materials. In all cases where the identity of nominees is not routinely known (e.g., Distinguished Contribution through Research) such identities should be kept in strictest confidence.

2. Conflict of Interest

A) Members

Members of NARST committees charged with determining the recipient(s) of an award need to be aware of potential conflict situations that may arise. Below are examples of potentially biasing affiliations or relationships. Should any of these conflicts arise, an Award Selection Committee member must bring the matter to the attention of the Selection Committee Chair who then informs the Chair of the Awards Committee.

- Employment at the same institution as the nominee
- Fellow candidate for an award
- Employment in an advisory capacity with the nominee or with his/her academic department
- Recent employment (within the last 12 months) with the nominee or with his/her academic unit
- Currently being considered for employment by the nominee or his/her academic unit
- Collaborated with the nominee on a professional project, research investigation, or scholarly publication/presentation
- Family relationship with nominee
- Close personal relationship with nominee
- Business association with nominee
- Past or present association as thesis advisor or advisee with nominee

B) Chairs/Co-Chairs: When a chair, co-chair or member of an awards committee is in a conflict of interest situation, he/she will reclude him/herself from the committee work until this conflict of interest is resolved or defer her/himself from consideration for the award (2004 Fall Board of Directors Meeting Minutes).

Duties of the Award Selection Committee Chairs

- Oversee the work of the Award Selection Committees.
- Assist the President-elect in identifying vacancies and appointing replacements on all award committees.
- Field questions from Award Selection Committee Chairs and assist them in resolving procedural issues that cannot be resolved internally.
- Attend to issues of equity and efficiency in the nomination and selection process.
- Review and compile semi-annual reports from Award Selection Committee Chairs.
- Contact all award recipients on behalf of the NARST Board to congratulate them and invite them to attend the NARST Annual International Conference Awards Luncheon.
- In addition to the Award Notification Letter sent out to the winner of each award by the co-chairs of the Awards Committee, a second “NARST Press Release” letter will be sent simultaneously to each award winner which each can use to forward to any agency they choose to announce their awards in a way that will benefit their professional status.

- Compile and forward all award recipient information and plaque inscription details to the Executive Director.
- Provide the names of the awardees to the Program Chair so their names can be in the program book with the awardees of earlier years, thereby making the names public information before the Awards Luncheon.

Duties of the Award Selection Committee Chairs

- Carry out the charge of their committees as stated in the *NARST Policies and Procedures Manual*.
- Attend Awards Committee Meeting during NARST Annual Conference.
- Chair meeting of their Award Selection Committee during NARST Annual Conference.
- Establish contact and availability with committee members soon after the conclusion of the Annual Conference.
- Share the Code of Conduct [Article IV] and Criteria for Service on Award Selection Committees [Article VI] with all committee members.
- Communicate problems in participation or requests for member replacements to the Awards Committee Chair.
- Submit semi-annual report to the Awards Committee Chair (September 15 and February 15).
- Follow stated procedures for changing Award Selection Committees procedures [Article III].
- Maintain the fairness and integrity of the award selection process.

Criteria for Service on Award Selection Committees

- Be a current NARST member.
 - Attend the Award Selection Committee meeting when present at the Annual Conference.
 - Perform required tasks in a timely fashion and within set deadlines.
 - Adhere to the Code of Conduct as specified in Article IV, in the Awards Committee procedures (i.e. maintain confidentiality and inform the committee chair of conflict of interest).
 - Inform the Award Selection Committee Chair immediately about any foreseen or sudden events that might interfere with completing assignments on time.
-

Subcommittees of the Awards Committee

JRST Award Selection Committee

Charge

The JRST Award Selection Committee is responsible for identifying the outstanding article appearing each year in *JRST*.

Procedures

Phase 1

During this phase, the outstanding article within each issue of the year's Volume is selected. Each committee member reads 2-3 issues and assigns points in various categories to each article (see Criteria) and ranks each article. Members of the committee are encouraged to contact other members reviewing the same issue via e-mail to discuss the relative merits of the articles and to utilize the diversity of expertise of our members. The article receiving the highest ranking from each issue is selected. If two or more articles are very close in ranking in a given issue, both articles are entered in the second phase review.

Phase 2

The article receiving the highest ranking from each issue is then reviewed a second time and rated. During this round, each committee member receives ten articles to read, evaluate and rank. Again, e-mail communication with other members of the committee is encouraged. At the end of this review, if two or more articles are close in ranking, a third round of reading assignments is made. These articles are evaluated, and each committee member assigns a rank order. The article receiving the highest rank is declared the outstanding article.

Time Line and Due Dates:

The dates in the time line are approximate, as actual dates will vary according to the dates for the NARST Annual International Conference.

July 15	Issues 1-5 evaluations due
Sept 15	Chair sends a report to the NARST Awards Committee Chair.
October 30	Issues 6-8 evaluations due
January 15	Issues 9 & 10 evaluations due
January 20	First round winners sent to members for second round evaluation
February 5	Second round evaluations due
February 15	Third round evaluations due (if a third round is needed)
February 28	Winning article and author(s) sent to NARST Awards Committee Chair, Executive Director and President.
February 28	Chair sends committee report to NARST Awards Committee Chair
March/April	Award presented at the NARST Annual Awards Luncheon

Documents and Sample Letters

Letter to Committee Members:

Dear:

Welcome to the JRST Award Selection Committee. As you know, our task is to find and identify the outstanding *JRST* research article for the year. The authors are recognized at the NARST Annual International Conference. This is an important way NARST recognizes excellence in scholarship in our research community, and our committee's task is a challenging and important one. Although the task requires significant time commitments, I see this task as one that can be intellectually stimulating for each of us as we are challenged to read carefully a broad spectrum of research and scholarship that is published in *JRST*. I think we will each come to value the diversity and multiple strengths of our organization as we engage in this process.

Phase 1

During this phase, the outstanding article within each issue of the year's Volume is selected. Each committee member will read 2-3 issues and assign points in various categories to each article (see Criteria) and rank each article. You are encouraged to contact other members reviewing the same issue via e-mail to discuss the relative merits of the articles and to utilize the diversity of expertise of our members. The article receiving the highest ranking from each issue will be selected. If two or more articles are very close in ranking in a given issue, we will enter both articles in the second phase review.

Phase 2

The article receiving the highest ranking from each issue is then reviewed a second time and rated. During this round, each committee member will receive ten articles to read, evaluate and rank. Again, e-mail communication with other members of the committee is encouraged. At the end of this review, if two or more articles are close in ranking, a third round of reading assignments will be made. These articles will be evaluated and each committee member will assign a rank order. The article receiving the highest rank is declared the outstanding article.

Evaluation forms and a criteria list are attached. They should be used for each article read in your assigned issues. If your first assignment includes Issues 1-5, you should complete and send them to me by July 15. Those members who were assigned numbers 6, 7 and 8 will need to submit their assessments by October 30. Finally, those with numbers 9 and 10 will need to submit their assessments by January 19, of the following year. You will receive the second round of ten papers to review by February 1. Please note the fast turn-around time in this round - we will need your reviews back by February 15.

I am asking each of you to acknowledge your receipt of this message and your acceptance of your reading and review assignment by sending me an e-mail message at <>. This will help me assure that we have enough reviewers for each issue. Please note your assignments in this message. Also attached is the address and e-mail address of all members. Please look at this information carefully and let me know if there are any changes.

Thank you for your willingness to serve on the JRST Award Selection Committee. All NARST members appreciate your help and support in this important endeavor. Please do not hesitate to e-mail me or call me if you have any questions. I look forward to working with you this year on the JRST Award Selection Committee.

Criteria and Instructions for Ranking the Articles in an Issue of the *JRST*

Read all articles in the issue you are judging before you begin the reading and rating process. Then rate all articles in the issue using the following criteria. After all articles are rated, review the ratings across articles to ensure consistency and reliability. In reviewing the articles try and ignore any personal prejudices that you may have about the importance or significance of the theme of the article and judge the article using only the following criteria. You are strongly encouraged to contact other members in your group to discuss your ratings.

1. Significance of Problem or Issue (10 points)

How important or critical is the problem or issue being addressed by the author(s)? Timeliness, relevance and scope are all aspects of this concept. Marks for this criterion should, however, be awarded not so much on your judgment of its significance but on the case made by the author(s) for its significance.

2. Background (10 points)

How adequate is the presentation of related theory and relevant literature? Does this section of the paper cover the literature in the area in a comprehensive and clear manner, acknowledging the significance of salient research and arguing the case for the work that is to be introduced?

3. Approach (10 points)

How adequate and sound is the approach to the problem or issue? In a research article there should be a well-reasoned argument for the design and the methods used for data analysis. In a position paper, the logic and nature of the argument should be carefully constructed and critically and thoughtfully argued.

4. Interpretation and Significance of Conclusions (10 points)

Are the conclusions based on a rigorous and systematic interpretation of the data and logical argument? In a position paper, do the arguments draw extensively on a wide-ranging body of literature to support the perspective developed. Are the implications and their importance recognized in a clear, thoughtful and cogent manner? Do they address relevant concerns in science education?

5. Potential Impact of the Outcomes or Positions (10 points)

What is the potential to influence thinking and practices in science education, the science education research community or both? Do the outcomes or positions have potential impact? Has that potential for impact been considered and discussed by the author(s)?

6. Uniqueness and Originality (10 points)

How new or original are the approach and/ or ideas presented in the article? Does the article challenge existing thinking or practice in a thoughtful, critical and relevant manner. Could the article be considered to be groundbreaking?

7. Overall (10 points)

What is your general opinion of the quality of the article from a broad perspective? In arriving at such a judgment, you should ignore any views you hold about the content or the theme and simply consider the whole article, how well the research has been designed, conducted and reported.

Record your ratings for each article on a separate rating sheet along with the necessary descriptive information about the article. You should also include comments related to your overall rating.

JRST Award Article Evaluation Form

JRST Volume _____, Number _____, Page #s _____

Title _____

AUTHORS: _____

Reviewer _____ Email _____ FAX _____

RATING SCALE

POOR BELOW AVERAGE ADEQUATE GOOD EXCELLENT

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Points Criterion Comments

1. _____ Significance of Problem or Issue
2. _____ Background
3. _____ Approach
4. _____ Interpretation and Significance of Conclusions
5. _____ Potential Impact of Outcomes or Position
6. _____ Uniqueness and Originality

7. _____ Overall

TOTAL _____ RANK _____

Please rank the articles in each issue using 1 to indicate the article you consider to be the best i.e., the highest scoring, 2 for the next best and so on.

OVERALL COMMENTS:

RETURN TO:

Award Selection Committee Chair: full contact details below

NARST Outstanding Paper Award Selection Committee

Charge

The NARST Outstanding Paper Award Selection Committee is responsible for identifying the outstanding paper presented at the previous year's NARST Annual International Conference.

Procedure

During the Annual International Conference, the session chairs, discussants and Board Members remind attendees that they may nominate any papers presented during the conferences. After the conference, the Awards Committee Chair sends an email notice to the NARST Listserv and an article to *E-NARST News*.

Nominees are contacted by email and invited to submit an electronic version (either an rtf or pdf file) of the paper within 6 weeks of the conference's conclusion. The Selection Committee Chair assigns each paper a number and the electronic files are called NARST##.rtf.

Selection of the NARST Outstanding Paper is conducted in three rounds.

In the **FIRST ROUND**, each paper is rated and ranked by five (5) committee members. Each committee member rates 10-12 papers. Papers are assigned to raters to avoid obvious conflicts of interest even though author names and affiliations remain anonymous. The criteria for evaluation focus equally on conceptual/theoretical framework, research approach, presentation and interpretation of research, conclusions, craftsmanship/communication, significance, and creativity (see Rating Sheet).

Upon completing the first round of review, the Chair will mail to all the nominees copies of the reviews they received on their papers.

In the **SECOND ROUND** each of the papers rated and ranked in round one in the top five are rated by five (5) committee members, with each committee member reviewing 5-6 papers. Assignment to reviewers is such that a committee member who reviewed a paper in the first round would not review the same paper in the second round.

In **ROUND THREE** those papers rated in round two in the top three are rated by all committee members to identify those papers ranked in the first, second, and third places.

Timeline

The dates in the time line are approximate, as actual dates will vary according to the dates for the NARST Annual International Conference.

September	First Round Reviews Completed
September 15	Chair sends a report to the NARST Awards Committee Chair.
December 5	Second Round Reviews completed

January Third round reviews completed
February 10 Recommendations forwarded to Awards Committee Chair, Executive Director and President
February 28 Recipient(s) notified by Awards Committee Chair
February Chair sends committee report to NARST Awards Committee Chair
March/April Award presented at the NARST Annual Awards Luncheon

Documents and Sample Letters

Letter to nominees

May

Dear Dr. :

Congratulations! Your paper _____ was nominated for the XXXX NARST Outstanding Paper Award. If you accept the nomination, NARST requires that you submit an electronic version of the paper for review. Please save the file as an .rtf or .pdf file titled as NARSTXX. Your name and the name of the co-authors and affiliations should appear on a separate cover page and only on this page, to ensure anonymity in the review process. Unfortunately, I do not have the staff to remove names and affiliations, so it is important that you complete this requirement. In order for your paper to be sent for review, I will need to receive the electronic version within 6 weeks of the end of the conference (DATE). Please note that the file you submit should be identical to the paper you presented at the NARST XXXX Annual International Conference; otherwise, your paper will be disqualified.

I appreciate your interest in the NARST Outstanding Paper Award and look forward to receiving and reading your paper. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at XXXXXXXXX or send me an E-mail message at XXXXXX

Sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXXXX

Chairperson, NARST Outstanding Paper Award Selection Committee

Letter to Committee Members

Dear :

The work of selecting the *NARST Outstanding Paper Award* is upon us. I am pleased to report that from among the papers presented at the XXXX Annual International Conference, XX papers were nominated for the *NARST Outstanding Paper Award*. Of those nominated, XX authors sent the required files. Each reviewer will receive a maximum of 10 papers for the first round of review. The scores reported on each paper will determine whether it will be included in the second round. I will use the results of the first round to cut the pool of papers in half.

I appreciate your willingness to work within an electronic review process. I will shortly send you rtf files of the papers to review for the first round, the rating and summary score sheet. Each paper will have a unique number ID as its file name. Please read each paper and use the descriptions on the Rating Sheet to make your assessment. Each criterion is worth ten (10) points. Please discriminate among the papers. Score high quality papers with high scores, mediocre papers with medium scores, and questionable papers with low scores. A high quality paper is one that is close to publication.

Clearly distinguishing among the papers will ensure that the best paper will receive the Outstanding Paper Award. Record your rating for each paper on a separate Rating Sheet. Once you have reviewed the papers, transfer your totals to the Summary Score Sheet. Rank-order your papers by giving the paper with the highest score the first ranking. Return the Summary Score Sheet, your Rating Sheets, and comments to me no later than _____.

I will mail Round Two reviews by _____ and will request that you complete this round of reviews by _____. Round Two reviews will result in the selection of the top 2 - 6 papers. All committee members will judge the 'final' round papers. I will send out the final round of reviews by _____ and request that you return them by _____.

If you receive a paper that creates a conflict of interest, please contact me as soon as possible. I will make arrangements to send the paper to another reviewer. Thank you in advance of your participation in this important activity of the NARST Awards Committee. Please contact me through E-mail (XXXX) or at XXXX, if you have any questions about the review process or the papers sent to you.

Sincerely,

Chair, NARST Outstanding Paper Award Selection Committee

NARST OUTSTANDING PAPER RATING SHEET (Rounds I & II)

PAPER NUMBER: _____ REVIEWER NUMBER: _____

CRITERION	RATING 10 points/criterion
<p>1. Conceptual/Theoretical: Is the study embedded in theoretical constructs? Does the study fit or reinforce the belief system that underlies the paradigm, which the research follows?</p>	
<p>2. Research Approach: <u>Empirical studies:</u> Is the methodology suitable to the question(s) asked (i.e., empirical or theoretical)? Is the description of method sufficient to allow the reader to understand what was done? <u>Non-empirical studies</u> (e.g. Conceptual or position papers, reviews of literature): Are the ideological/philosophical positions of the author and sources used made clear and are they appropriate to the topic(s) under discussion? Is the range and scope of literature and opinions presented and referenced appropriate?</p>	
<p>3. Presentation and interpretation of research <u>Empirical studies:</u> Are the research findings presented coherently and clearly? Are the interpretations of the research supported by the data and evidence, or could other interpretations be valid? Does the author temper her/his interpretations and claims with consideration of their reliability and validity? <u>Non-empirical studies</u> (e.g. Conceptual or position papers, reviews of literature): Does the author discuss the arguments and present argument and counter-argument? Are the arguments systematically presented and well reasoned? Is there a logical/rational flow?</p>	
<p>4. Conclusions: 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?</p>	
<p>5. Craftsmanship/Communication: Does the paper demonstrate clarity, coherence, insightfulness, and incisiveness in communication? Does the paper advance a central idea(s) or theme(s)?</p>	
<p>6. Significance of the Study: How important is the study to the science education community and/or the education community at large?</p>	
<p>7. Creativity: Does the study break new ground? Does it involve risk-taking? Does it invite criticism?</p>	
<p>COMMENTS: TOTAL:</p>	<hr/> <p align="center">70 points</p>

Please save one rating sheet per paper reviewed as NARST#R#.doc or .PDF

Distinguished Contribution to Science Education through Research Award Selection Committee

Charge

The Distinguished Contribution to Science Education through Research Award Selection Committee is responsible for identifying a member of NARST whose lifetime research has made a significant impact in science education.

The Award

NARST desires to recognize and reward individuals who have made significant contributions to science education through research. The recipient of the Distinguished Contribution to Science Education Through Research Award should have contributed over a period of at least 20 years since the award of his or her doctorate and should be at the pinnacle of his/her career. The award is 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.

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. This award is the highest recognition NARST can bestow for contributions to science education through exemplary, high quality research. The Distinguished Contribution through Research Award Selection Committee is responsible for soliciting nominations for this award, reviewing nominations, and recommending awardee(s) to the NARST Board of Directors.

Procedures (Revised procedures approved at the October 2010 Board Meeting)

- 1) The call for nominations is publicized on several occasions (at least about May 15 and June 15) between the Annual Meeting and the closing date for nominations (about July 15). All that is necessary is for someone to send a name or names to the committee by about July 15 along with no more than a one-page letter supporting the nomination of the person.
- 2) The role of the members of the DCA Committee will be limited to reviewing nominations, deliberating about the nominees, and voting to select the recipient(s). Committee members will neither nominate, nor write letters of reference (see #8 below) for, candidates for the DCA Award.
- 3) The DCA committee reviews the names submitted and strikes any that do not meet the basic criteria (e.g., 20 years since doctoral degree).
- 4) If more than 10 nominations are received, the committee deliberates and discusses the merits of potential nominees with the objective of reaching a short list.
- 5) After the closing of nominations and committee deliberations, the committee short lists no more than 10 candidates drawn from names submitted by the membership. The committee creates this short list based on the existing criteria for the award.

- 6) After the short list of no more than 10 candidates is finalized, it is shared with the Awards Committee Chair.
- 7) After notifying the Awards Committee Chair, the DCA Award Committee Chair contacts all persons on the short list asking if they wish to be considered for the nomination. Those accepting a nomination will be asked to submit a CV using the current format. The CVs are due by about September 1. Each person will also be asked to name someone who would act as his or her nominator who is to provide no more than a two one-page nomination of the person (if not already done under #1 above).
- 8) The Committee reviews all CVs and two one-page nominations and develops a slate of no more than four nominees no later than October 1. The DCA Committee Chair then contacts these four and their nominators to request three letters of reference per nominee, each no more than two pages. It will be the nominator's responsibility to make sure that the letters of reference are submitted on time. Reference letters are due by November 15.
- 9) The Committee makes a final decision by December 15 and reports the decision to the NARST Awards Committee Chair. In the event of there being more than one worthy recipient the Committee can decide to make more than one award.
- 10) By January 15, the Committee Chair notifies the award recipient(s) and sends a letter to other finalists not receiving the award.

Call for Nominations

The committee to select the NARST Distinguished Contribution to Science Education through Research Award requests nominees from the NARST membership. The recipient of this award should have contributed over a period of at least 20 years since the award of his or her doctorate and should be at the pinnacle of his/her career. This award is the highest recognition NARST can bestow for contributions to science education through exemplary, high-quality research. Please note that the award will be made to an individual who, over a period of at least 20 years, has:

1. made a continuing contribution to science education through research;
2. provided notable leadership in science education through research; and
3. 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 and supporting letters to the Chair of the Distinguished Contribution through Research Award Selection Committee.

Criteria

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 and should be at the pinnacle of his/her career. This award is the highest recognition NARST can bestow for contributions to science education through exemplary, high quality research. 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 to science education through research.
-

Early Career Research Award Selection Committee

Charge

The Early Career Research Award Selection Committee is responsible for identifying a member of NARST whose research in the five years immediately following receipt of the doctorate is worthy of recognition by NARST.

Procedures

1. March/April NARST Annual International Conference. Obtain list of committee members and determine addresses including e-mail, fax, and phone.
2. August/September. First Call for Nominations via the NARST Listserv, *E-NARST News* and NARST Web site.

Nominations are to be sought from as wide a field of candidates as possible to be inclusive of gender, age and ethnicity.

Timeline

The dates in the time line are approximate, as actual dates will vary according to the dates for the NARST Annual International Conference.

April - Call for Nominations for the upcoming year via *E-NARST News*.

August - issue 1st call for nominations on the NARST Listserv and NARST web site

September - issue 2nd call for nominations on the NARST Listserv

Sept 15 - Chair sends a report to the Awards Committee Chair.

November 15 - nominations due. The Chair reviews all packages for completeness and requests additional material where necessary.

November 20 - When the packages are complete, they are organized with one copy of each package for each of the six reviewers along with a rating sheet for each nominee. An e-mail is also sent so that reviewers will be expecting the package. Send consolation letters to the other finalists.

January 1 - The ratings and recommendations are received from committee members. The Chair reviews and summarizes the results. . In the event of there being more than one worthy recipient the Committee can decide to make more than one award.

Before or by February 1 - Notify Awards Committee Chair, Executive Director and President of results. This notification must be sufficiently informative for the Executive Director to prepare the Plaque. Include the candidate's name, institution, date and institution of Ph.D. award, and inscription of about 100 words.

By mid February: Submit report for spring NARST Board of Directors meeting to Awards Committee Chair.

March/April - Review and modify as necessary the procedure for managing this committee (summarized in this document). Submit any changes to the Awards Committee Chair.

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, XXXX. *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, 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, and
- e) 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 XXXXXXXX at the address below no later than November 15, XXXX.

Early Career Research Award Selection Committee 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:

II. 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.)

Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee

Charge

The Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee is responsible for identifying a doctoral dissertation completed by a NARST member in the previous year that is worthy of recognition by NARST.

Procedures

1. At the NARST Annual International Conference decisions relating to the following year's procedures are discussed and agreed by the committee.
2. Send the Call for Submissions for the Award to the *E-NARST News* and have it posted on the NARST listserv and NARST web site (see example attached). Nominations are to be sought from as wide a field of candidates as possible to be inclusive of gender, age and ethnicity.
3. Send a letter of introduction and timeline for the upcoming process to the committee. Send reminder to NARST listserv.
4. Acknowledge receipt of submissions as they arrive and check NARST membership of candidates.
5. Assign ID numbers randomly to submissions. Send packages containing abstracts, rating sheets, criteria for judging, and a cover letter (with deadline reminder) to the committee.
6. Receive and acknowledge ratings from committee. Combine the ratings, determine the average rank for each applicant and select the top three or four candidates as finalists. Inform the committee of the results of judging.
7. Inform all candidates about the status of their abstracts, and request full dissertations from finalists.

8. Assign ID numbers to complete dissertations and send rating sheets, criteria for judging, and a cover letter (with deadline reminder) to the committee.
9. Receive and acknowledge ratings from committee members. Combine the ratings, determine the recipient and inform the Awards Committee Chair, Executive Director and President.
10. Awards Committee Chair informs recipient(s) of the result.
11. Send consolation letters to the other finalists.
12. Prepare Spring Board report by February 15 and forward to Awards Committee Chair.

In the event of there being more than one worthy recipient the Committee can decide to make more than one award.

Timeline

The dates in the time line are approximate, as actual dates will vary according to the dates for the NARST Annual International Conference.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Event</u>
April-May	Chair of Awards Committee sends announcement to the <i>E-NARST News</i> , NARST Listserv and NARST web site
July-August	Chair of Awards Committee posts announcement on Listserv
Sept 1	Chair of Selection Committee sends email to committee members reminding them of the upcoming process, and checks addresses for sending abstracts
Sept 15	Deadline for receiving abstracts Chair sends letters/emails to candidates acknowledging receipt of abstracts as they arrive
Sept 15	Chair sends a report to the Awards Committee Chair.
Sept 20	Chair sends packages of abstracts to committee members
End Oct	Deadline for receiving ratings of abstracts from committee members
Nov 5	Chair informs committee members of outcome from first round of judging
Nov 5	Chair contacts all candidates regarding status of abstracts
Nov 20	Deadline to receive unbound copy of dissertation from finalists
End Nov	Chair sends dissertations and cover letter to committee members Committee members acknowledge receipt of package by email ASAP
mid Jan	Chair sends a reminder to committee members that the deadline for dissertation ratings is end of January.
End Jan	Deadline for receiving final rankings
Early Feb	Declare award recipient(s) and inform NARST Awards Committee Chair, Executive Director and President. The Awards Committee Chair contacts the recipient.
Mid Feb	Chair sends letter to committee members notifying them of the recipient(s) and sends consolation letter to other finalists.

Chair sends committee report to NARST Awards Committee Chair by email.

March-April NARST Annual International Conference. Chair prepares agenda to enable discussion and agreement about judging process, timelines, etc., for the following year.

Sample Call for Submissions for Outstanding Doctoral Research Award

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 should 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.)

The Chair of the Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Committee must receive an email with all three attachments at *e-mail address* no later than September 15. 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 NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award

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.

Abstract ID	1. Significance	2. Background	3. Research Approach	4. Conclusions	5. Communication	6. Originality	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

Please send a copy of your unbound dissertation to the address below, to arrive by [give date]

Place name of Chair, address and contact details here

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,

Signed

Chair, NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee

NARST Web site Award Announcements & Information for E-NARST News

1) Distinguished Contributions Award

NARST Distinguished Contribution to Science Education through Research Award Nominees

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. 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 30 August 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.

2) Doctoral Research Award

NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award

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, xxxx to submit an expanded ten-page abstract (in PDF format) to the committee for consideration for the xxxx NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award. Submissions are sought from as wide a field of candidates as possible, 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 applicants will be asked to submit one copy (in PDF format) of the complete dissertation. The final decision of the committee will be based on the complete dissertation. All applicants will be notified of their status after the first round of judging is completed in early November. The recipient will be announced at the awards luncheon at the xxxx NARST Annual International Conference in yyyy.

The committee welcomes doctoral dissertations from all research perspectives. The ten-page abstract should be structured to describe clearly the following: (1) purpose or objectives of the study; (2) conceptual/theoretical framework; (3) research approach/methods; (4) data sources and methods of analysis; (5) findings or results; (6) conclusions and implications; and (7) significance of the study. It is suggested that nominees model their abstracts after conference proposals submitted for NARST: Abstracts should foreground rationale, methods, and results.

Judging in both rounds (for abstracts and dissertations) will be based on the following three central questions: (1) Are the research question(s) being asked of importance to the community of science educators? (2) Is the research approach and its implementation thorough and appropriate for the research question(s) asked? 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 who were 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: An all-electronic submission process will be used. Persons wishing to be considered for the award should submit an e-mail with the following three attachments (in PDF format): (1) one file containing a ten-page, double-spaced abstract (margins limited to one 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 of that 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. This 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 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.

3) Early Career Research Award

Early Career Research Award: Submission Invitation

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

NARST

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:

II. 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

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:

IV. Summary

Total Numeric Rating _____

Overall Rank _____

Among Nominees _____

(1st, 2nd, etc.)

4) JRST Award

Journal of Research in Science Teaching (JRST) Award Information

The Journal of Research in Science Teaching Award Committee is charged with selecting the outstanding research article from the journal each year. This award allows NARST to recognize excellence in scholarship within our research community. Every article that is published in *JRST* is automatically considered for the award. There are two phases in the review process.

Phase 1 □: In the first phase, each committee member reads 2-3 issues, reviews each article, and then ranks the articles within each issue (from most outstanding to least outstanding). Committee members may contact other members reviewing the same issues to discuss the relative merits of the articles and to utilize the diversity of expertise of our members. The article receiving the lowest ranking from each issue is selected to continue on to a second phase of review. If two or more articles are very close in ranking in a given issue, both articles enter the second phase of review.

Phase 2: The articles that received the lowest ranking from each issue are reviewed a second time and ranked. During this round, all committee members read, evaluate and rank the top articles from each issue. Again, communication with other members of the committee is encouraged. At the end of this review, if two or more articles are close in ranking, a third round of reading assignments is made. These articles are evaluated and each committee member assigns a rank order. The article receiving the lowest rank is declared the outstanding article. The recipients of the *JRST* Award are announced and recognized at the Award's Luncheon of the NARST Annual International Conference each year.

For more information about the *JRST* Award, please contact Chair of the *JRST* Award Committee, at [e-mail address](#).

5) NARST Outstanding Paper Award

Award Description

The NARST Outstanding Paper Award is given each year to the best paper presented at the NARST Annual International Conference. Eligible papers should be of publishable quality and should be submitted in a version identical to the one distributed at the time of the conference presentation. In particular, the title of the paper, names of the contributing authors, and order of authorship should be identical to the way this information appeared in the NARST Annual International Conference program. When preparing the paper for submission, the authors should adopt the Journal of Research in Science Teaching criteria for blinding the paper for the review process.

Deadline for Nominations

The deadline for submitting nominations for the xxxx Award is May 20, yyyy. Send nominations containing the author name(s) and title of paper to Committee Co-Chair, via e-mail.

Procedure

Selection of the NARST Outstanding Paper is conducted in three rounds. In the First Round, each paper is rated and ranked by three committee members. Papers are assigned to raters to avoid obvious conflicts of interest even though author names and affiliations remain anonymous. The criteria for evaluation focus equally on significance, conceptual/theoretical background, research approach, conclusions craftsmanship/communication, and creativity. Five top ranked papers from first round are selected for second round. In the Second Round, three committee members rate each of the five papers. Assignment to reviewers is such that a committee member who reviewed it in the first round reviews no paper in the second round. In Round Three those papers rated in round two in the top three are rated by all committee members to identify those papers ranked in the first, second, and third places.

Criteria

Reviewers use the following scoring sheet to score the nominated papers.

CRITERION	RATING 10 points/ criterion
<p>1. Conceptual/Theoretical: Is the study embedded in theoretical constructs? Does the study fit or reinforce the belief system that underlies the paradigm, which research follows?</p>	
<p>2. Research Approach: <u>Empirical studies:</u> Is the methodology suitable to the question(s) asked (i.e., empirical or theoretical)? Is the description of method sufficient to allow the reader to understand what was done? <u>Non-empirical studies</u> (e.g., conceptual or position papers, reviews of literature): Are the ideological/philosophical positions of the author and sources used made clear and are they appropriate to the topic(s) under discussion? Is the range and scope of literature and opinions presented and referenced appropriate?</p>	
<p>3. Presentation and interpretation of research <u>Empirical studies:</u> Are the research findings presented coherently and clearly? Are the interpretations of the research supported by the data and evidence, or could other interpretations be valid? Does the author temper her/his interpretations and claims with consideration of their reliability and validity?</p>	
<p><u>Non-empirical studies</u> (e.g. Conceptual or position papers, reviews of literature): Does the author discuss the arguments and present argument and counter-argument? Are the arguments systematically presented and well reasoned? Is there a logical/rational flow?</p>	
<p>4. Conclusions: 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?</p>	
<p>5. Craftsmanship/Communication: Does the paper demonstrate clarity, coherence, insightfulness, and incisiveness in communication? Does the paper advance a central idea(s) or theme(s)?</p>	
<p>6. Significance of the Study: How important is the study to the science education community and/or the education community at large?</p>	

<p>7. Creativity: Does the study break new ground? Does it involve risk-taking? Does it invite criticism?</p>	
<p>COMMENTS: TOTAL:</p>	<p>70 points</p>