

## Proposal Submission Guidelines

The ILA 2018 Conference & Exhibits (ILA 2018) is an ideal forum for literacy professionals to share their knowledge and best practices and to network with colleagues. The educational programming that is submitted, reviewed, and selected by literacy educators is key to the event's success. Due to space and time limitations, only an estimated 30% of submissions can be accepted each year. This acceptance rate maintains a high level of programming—and it's a primary reason ILA conferences are so successful. All reviewed proposals must be submitted electronically via the ILA 2018 Proposal Submission Site by the date on the proposal submission website. After that, reviewed proposals **will no longer be accepted**.

### Instructions for Proposal Submission

1. Read this Proposal Submission Guidelines document and all linked resources.
2. Log in with your username name and password (if you submitted in 2016 you can use these credentials) or create a profile at [ilaconference.org/proposals](http://ilaconference.org/proposals).
3. After you log in, click Create New Proposal. The submission page showing the tabs that require completion will appear. Please familiarize yourself with the tab headers and required fields before entering any information.
4. All text boxes show character limits, which includes characters and spaces, and will count down as you enter your information. You can copy and paste from a previously created document; however, please check the character counts before copying and pasting so your content is not cut off in the system.
5. Create a concise, engaging, and accurate title for your proposal that reflects the presentation content and will entice attendees. Do not enter presenter information in the title field.
6. Choose your **session type** carefully; once you make your selection in the system, you **cannot** change it.
7. Follow the instructions on the Presenter(s) tab to assign the primary and copresenters. (The *primary presenter* is the author who is submitting the proposal and to whom all correspondence from ILA will be sent; *copresenters* are all additional presenters contributing to the proposal.)
8. Select the appropriate age level for your presentation, a **category** to guide the peer-review process, a **strand** (if applicable), and the target audiences for your presentation.
9. As you complete your submission, refer to the [\*\*ILA 2018 Scoring Rubric for Peer-Reviewed Presentation Formats\*\*](#).
10. Your proposal will not be submitted until you click Finalize. After it is submitted, you may edit the proposal (except for the presentation format) until the submission deadline. (Remember to click Finalize in order to submit your edits.)

### Notification

Notification of acceptance/nonacceptance will be sent via e-mail in early **December 2017**.

### Registration Fees

All presenters are responsible for their ILA 2018 Conference & Exhibits registration fees and any expenses associated with the presentation. For accepted Preconference Institute proposals, complimentary registrations are offered for up to 10 presenters for the day of the Preconference Institute ONLY.

# ILA 2018 SCORING RUBRIC FOR PEER-REVIEWED PRESENTATION FORMATS

## (Preconference Institute, Hands-On Workshop, Session, Panel, Poster Presentation)

	1 INSUFFICIENT	2 POOR	3 FAIR	4 GOOD	5 EXCELLENT
(1) Is the presenter <b>knowledgeable and experienced</b> in the topic area?	There is no evidence that the presenter is knowledgeable or experienced in the topic area.	There is some indication that the presenter is knowledgeable or experienced in the topic area.	The presenter is sufficiently knowledgeable and experienced in the topic area.	The presenter is very knowledgeable and experienced in the topic area.	Not only is the presenter very knowledgeable and experienced in the topic area, he/she is best suited to present this topic.
(2) How well do the <b>title, description, and learning objectives/takeaways</b> align with each other?	There is no connection or it is not clear.	There is a connection but the presenter did not successfully convey the connection.	The connection is clear, but the language needs refinement.	They align and the proposal uses language that effectively conveys the content and learning objectives/takeaways.	They align and the proposal clearly and accurately conveys the complex relationships between title, description, and learning objectives/takeaways.
(3) Does the proposal show <b>evidence of current research and/or best practices</b> in the field?	There is no indication that the proposal is grounded in research or best practices.	The proposal states no specific research or best practices but is an accepted application in the field.	The proposal states some relevant research and/or best practices.	The proposal states relevant, current research and/or best practices.	The proposal clearly indicates a grounding in and intent to apply relevant, current research and/or best practices.
(4) How likely is it that the <b>format and delivery methods</b> selected will allow participants to achieve the stated learning objectives/takeaways?	The format and delivery methods are inappropriate or not clear.	The format and delivery methods may be appropriate, but the proposal does not effectively convey how they will help participants meet learning objectives/takeaways.	The format and delivery methods are appropriate and have the potential to achieve some of the learning objectives/takeaways.	The format and delivery methods are appropriate and will achieve all of the learning objectives/takeaways.	The format and delivery methods are appropriate and are uniquely suited to achieve and possibly exceed the learning objectives/takeaways.
(5) How well does the structure of the presentation allow for <b>audience engagement</b> appropriate to the learning objectives/takeaways?	The structure will not allow for appropriate audience engagement or is unclear.	The structure may allow for appropriate audience engagement but it is not exactly clear from the proposal.	It is likely that the structure will allow for appropriate audience engagement.	The proposal clearly demonstrates that the structure is appropriate for audience engagement and is appropriate for the objectives/takeaways.	Not only does the proposal clearly demonstrate that the audience engagement is appropriate for the objectives and the audience, but attendees will be highly engaged throughout the session.
(6) Given the limited number of presentation slots available and the high volume of proposals received, how likely would you be to <b>attend or recommend</b> this presentation if placed on the program?	The topic is not current or appropriate. I would not attend or recommend it.	The topic is somewhat related to issues in the field, but is not current. I would probably not attend or recommend it.	The topic may not be current but focuses on issues appropriate to the field. I may attend or recommend it.	The topic is current and appropriate to the field. I would probably attend or recommend it.	The topic is current, relevant, or important to the field. I would definitely attend or recommend it.

## ILA 2018 PRESENTATION FORMATS

### Peer-Reviewed Educational Programming Eligible for ILA Clock Hours

Submissions must be made in one of the following presentation formats. (The Special Interest Group Session is an additional format this year, more info to come.)

FORMAT	DURATION	DESCRIPTION	NO. OF PRESENTERS
<b>PRECONFERENCE INSTITUTE</b>	Full day, Friday, 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM (one-hour lunch break and one morning coffee break)	Full-day, preconference meeting—requiring separate, paid registration from the ILA 2018 Conference & Exhibits registration—in which a group of presenters explore a common theme or issue in depth. The format may include formal presentations, panels, audience question-and-answer sessions, small-group discussions, workshop activities, and demonstrations. The selection of activities will depend on the theme, objectives, and types of information to be presented. Institute organizers are provided one main room and up to two additional breakout rooms (please request these in your proposal submission). For accepted Preconference Institute proposals, complimentary registrations, for the day of the Preconference Institute only, are offered for up to 10 presenters.	1 to 10
<b>HANDS-ON WORKSHOP</b>	2 hrs	Designed to provide attendees opportunities to participate actively in a learning experience on a common topic. Formal presentations are discouraged; the major portion of the program should be devoted to activities that actively engage the audience with the topic or materials under consideration. Seating is strictly limited to 75 people.	1 to 5
<b>SESSION</b>	1 hr	Standard presentation designed to offer attendees one or two short presentations on a common topic.	1 or 2
<b>PANEL</b>	1 hr	Presentation at which several speakers deliver short addresses on a common topic and then engage in interaction with each other and the audience.	3 to 5
<b>POSTER PRESENTATION</b>	1 hr	Posters are displayed in a central location in the conference convention center, and presenters provide information on their specific topic. Each session includes up to 15 poster presentations grouped by category. Attendees move between and among posters and talk with presenters about their work; feedback and discussion are encouraged at each station. Poster presentations submitted in the “Research” category must include background research, methodology, and summary or research findings.	1 to 5

## ILA 2018 SUBMISSION CATEGORIES

Select one category to help guide the peer-review process. Please select the category that best fits your proposal.

- Children’s & Young Adult Literature**—Engaging students and increasing their literacy learning through multiple genres of children’s and young adult literature.
- Coaching & Literacy Leadership**—Exploring best practices and professional standards that support educators in these roles.
- Content Area Literacy**—Building literacy capacity across content areas to increase student comprehension and achievement.
- Differentiation for Exceptional Learners**—Implementing instructional strategies to meet the needs of diverse student populations, including English learners, advanced learners, struggling learners, and students with disabilities.
- Engaging Classroom Instruction**—Utilizing practical literacy strategies for high engagement and rich student learning.
- Foundational Skills**—Examining the essential skills necessary for creating successful, lifelong learners, including fluency, comprehension, phonics, phonological and phonemic awareness, and vocabulary.
- Innovating With Technology**—Integrating technology into literacy instruction in authentic, impactful ways.
- International Literacy Instruction**—Highlighting international literacy issues at the instructional level that are of interest to educators across the globe.
- Literacy Policy, Advocacy, & Research**—Delving into policy issues that affect literacy educators, ways to serve as effective literacy education advocates, and/or cutting-edge studies that inform literacy instruction and decision making.
- Standards & Assessments**—Addressing instructional shifts driven by standards, including Common Core; strategies for implementation; and using formative and performance assessments to inform decision making about the needs of individual learners.
- Teacher Preparation & Professional Development**—Preparing effective literacy educators and/or strengthening their ongoing professional learning.

# ILA 2018 Proposal Selection Process FAQ

## Who Reviews Submitted Proposals?

Reviewers are selected through an annual call for volunteers. Reviewers use a standard rubric to evaluate submissions for the five peer-reviewed presentation formats offered: Preconference Institute, Hands-On Workshop, Session, Panel, and Poster Presentation. Criteria are evaluated on a scale of 1–5 (1 = insufficient; 5 = excellent). **[View the ILA 2018 rubric.](#)**

## Are the Proposals Blind Reviewed?

Proposals undergo a half-blind review process in which reviewers are not revealed to the session presenters but session presenters are revealed to reviewers. A successful session requires strong content and organization as well as a presenter who has the background and experience to discuss the topic. The half-blind review process allows presenters to share their backgrounds, affiliations, and any other evidence of their expertise with reviewers. The half-blind review puts all presenters on a level playing field to build the case for their expertise.

## How Are Proposals Selected for Acceptance?

Proposals are ranked based on reviewer ratings. Because there are usually far more high-quality proposals than space available, additional screening is required to reduce the number of presentations and balance the overall program in terms of topics and grade-level representation. Space limitations usually mean that some high-quality sessions are not accepted.

## Are There Ever Conflicts of Interest Between Reviewers and Presenters?

Reviewers are randomly assigned to specific proposals, so there is the potential for a reviewer to be assigned a proposal in which he or she has a vested interest or close connection. Reviewers declare conflicts of interest and are reassigned to other proposals. ILA trusts reviewers to determine what constitutes a conflict of interest that would create an unfair review environment and to recuse themselves from evaluating such proposals.

**For additional information about submitting a proposal for presentation at ILA 2018, please contact [conferenceproposals@reading.org](mailto:conferenceproposals@reading.org).**

# ILA 2018 Learning Strands

At ILA 2018, in addition to a diverse program of sessions and workshops, attendees will have the opportunity to focus their conference experience on one of three learning strands: **Administrators as Literacy Leaders**, **Literacy Coaching**, and **Literacy Research**. If your proposed session falls into one of these three strands, please indicate that on the Categories tab during the review process. Submitting a proposal for a strand does not guarantee a spot on the conference program.

## Administrators as Literacy Leaders

School leaders understand that literacy is the foundation for all learning. In what ways are you creating a culture of literacy in your building or district? How are you encouraging and inspiring your teaching staff to explore new literacy strategies? How are you engaging students and their caregivers in understanding the value of literacy?

## Literacy Coaching

Coaches with demonstrated knowledge and skill in foundational literacy knowledge, assessment and intervention, and leadership are vital to improved literacy outcomes in schools. How has literacy coaching revitalized student literacy growth in your school or district? How has an investment in strong coaches bolstered classroom practices?

## Literacy Research

Research provides the backbone to effective literacy instruction and arms educators with the rationale behind strategies to help their students succeed. What is the latest research on literacy instruction? How does that research inform and translate to new best practices?