Reviewing Convention Proposals for TESOL International Association

Updated May 2019
Welcome to this general training session for reviewers of TESOL International Association’s convention proposals. Each year, our convention draws over 6,000 TESOL professionals to four days of professional development. But to get there, we rely on the expertise of our members to review and rate the thousands of proposals we receive. We can’t thank you enough for your time and dedication in helping to select the presentations, panels and workshops that will benefit our colleagues from around the world.

Because of the nature of our review process, all reviewers are asked to complete two training modules: a general training and a strand-specific training. This webinar constitutes the general portion and should be completed by all reviewers, regardless of strand. Strand coordinators and assistant coordinators will provide you with information on the strand-specific training.
In this general training, we will go over the review process, then examine how our personal and professional backgrounds may influence proposal review and how to use our awareness of our own biases to review fairly and identify proposals which may require additional review. We will introduce you to the abstract system and review the rubric and tips for writing comments.
Before we begin, you may find it helpful to have the documents we will refer to in this workshop handy. You can find them on the TESOL 2020 Call for Proposals webpage, which you can locate by going to tinyurl.com/TESOL2020-CFP.

Familiarize yourself with instructions given to proposal writers and used in writing proposals:

https://tinyurl.com/TESOL2020-CFP
Documents to Review

- Rubric
- Strand descriptions
- Settings and contexts
- Session types
- Session focus
- Checklist for proposal writers

We will be referring to the rubric, strands, contexts, settings, session types, session focus, and the checklist for proposal writers.
Let’s begin with a quick overview of the proposal review process.
Once the submission deadline passes, each proposal is assigned to reviewers, who will read the proposals and rate them using the rubric. This portion of the process is blind - you should not be able to determine who has written a proposal. You will receive an email with the link to the abstract management system once proposals are assigned.

We do our best to assign reviewers with expertise in the area of the proposal, including the setting (such as adult education, primary school, international teaching assistants), the context (ESL, EFL, bilingual or multilingual education, and so forth), and the focus (research, pedagogy, conceptual, policy). However, with the number of proposals we receive and the number of reviewers we have, you may find that you are assigned a proposal in an area outside of your expertise. If this occurs, it is important that you alert your strand and assistant strand coordinators so that the proposal can be reassigned.

Also, we ask that every reviewer read at least 10 proposals. We recommend planning 15 to 20 minutes per proposal, or about three hours over three weeks for a group of 10. If you find that you are assigned more proposals than you can review or that you are able to review additional proposals, please let your coordinators know as soon as
possible so that these can be reassigned.

You will have approximately three weeks to complete the reviews. Once all initial reviews have been completed, the strand and assistant strand coordinators examine highly rated proposals and make recommendations, keeping in mind program balance. Finally, the Conferences Professional Council and TESOL staff review these recommendations to finalize the list of accepted sessions.
Your strand and assistant strand coordinators are here to support you throughout the review process. Please make sure to contact them if you are assigned a proposal that is outside your expertise or if you would like fewer or more proposals to review.
As an international organization we are very aware of issues which may be taken for granted by more homogeneous groups but cannot be in ours. Even areas such as language use and the appropriateness of a topic for a professional convention are subject to filtering through our individual experiences. This section addresses issues which occur in reviewing proposals in a culturally and linguistically diverse profession.
Each of us has many identities, both personal and professional, which influence the way we read and understand proposals. Please take a moment to consider these questions:

• What topics are appropriate for inclusion in the TESOL International Convention program?
• What are the characteristics of a well-written proposal?
• Would you rate proposals by women differently than proposals by men?

All three questions illustrate biases that reviewers bring to the process.
Reflection 1

• What topics are appropriate for inclusion in the TESOL International Convention program?

The appropriateness of a topic is the focus of the first section of the proposal evaluation rubric. You may be able to clearly articulate your own concept of an appropriate topic. How does your response match the actual range of proposals at the convention? Let’s take a look.
Here are just a few examples from the approximately 1,000 sessions at the 2019 Convention.
On this slide, you see titles for sessions ranging from vocabulary and grammar to listening and technology, content-based instruction and special populations. All of these sessions further TESOL’s strategic plan goal of leading in “the development and delivery of English language teaching expertise, research, and information that address current and emerging trends in the profession.”
TESOL’s strategic plan also states that the Association empowers TESOL professionals “to be effective advocates for their students, their programs, themselves, and for one another.” The 2019 program included many presentations on identity and social issues including race and ethnicity; gender, gender expression, and sexuality; learning differences; nonnative speaker status; culture; religious affiliation; economic status; disability; and human rights.

How did your response to the question on appropriate proposals match the 2019 sessions? Because the convention draws an international audience, the issues and perspectives you encounter in your own cultural and teaching context may differ significantly from those in a different context. Please keep in mind this broader perspective as you review proposals.
Proposal Topics

TESOL welcomes proposals on all topics relevant to the teaching and learning of English.

We welcome proposals on all topics relevant to the teaching and learning of English which will be of interest to attendees of the convention.
As you review proposals, keep in mind TESOL’s values for professionalism, respect, integrity, and lifelong learning . . .
Non-Discrimination Policy

“In principle and in practice, TESOL values and seeks diverse and inclusive participation within the field of English language teaching. TESOL promotes involvement and broad access to professional opportunities for all and works to eliminate any kind of discrimination including, but not limited to, language background, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, age, sexual orientation, nationality, disability, appearance, or geographic location.”

as well as the non-discrimination policy. We want to be inclusive, we want to represent multiple voices and perspectives in the field, and we want to be sure proposals adhere to these core values.
As you review proposals, also keep in mind TESOL’s strategic plan goals: to increase its global presence and connectivity among members, partners, and other stakeholders; to lead the development and delivery of English language teaching expertise, research, and information that address current and emerging trends in the profession, and to be the leading advocate for English language teaching professionals and learners worldwide.

More details on TESOL’s values, non-discrimination policy and strategic goals can be found at tesol.org.
Reflection 2

• What are the characteristics of a well-written proposal?

The second reflection asked you to articulate the characteristics of a well-written proposal. Whatever your response, it likely reflects the expectations of the academic environment familiar to you. Would you automatically rate a proposal without citations lower than a proposal with them? What about a proposal with the repeatedly used before nouns where a native speaker wouldn’t use an article?
For the 2019 Convention, TESOL received proposals from almost 70 countries and from many non-native English speakers. As reviewers, it is important to distinguish between variations in English as an international language and proposals which are poorly conceived or hastily submitted. Multiple typographical errors, for example, may indicate lack of preparation, while differences in spelling reflect language variation. This year, the proposal form also includes an optional field for citations. The proposal form does not specify a format, so differences here may simply reflect alternative academic practices. Rather than focusing form, look for clear descriptions of the content using the Checklist for Proposal Writers as a guide.

English as an International Language

• Recognize linguistic variation

• Distinguish between dialectical variation and poorly-conceived or hastily-submitted proposals
Recognizing Regional Variation

- Recognize status often assigned to different varieties, including regional cultural variations
  - African American English
  - Caribbean English

- Distinguish variation from “mistakes”

it is important to recognize that different varieties of a language may be perceived as having higher or lower social status, but TESOL works to support the inclusivity of multiple varieties and variations of English. This includes regional cultural variations of English. For example, African American English and Caribbean English have specific grammar patterns that have evolved historically through interaction with a variety of African Languages, and through creativity and in direct opposition to standardized English, which has been used as a tool of oppression in some contexts.

Regional cultural variations are not “mistakes,” rather they are variations,

As many of our members and colleagues are utilizing English as an additional language, and we value the voices of those in a variety of contexts, we want to be inclusive of opportunities to participate. Proposals by those writing in English as an additional language should not be penalized for occasional errors due to language proficiency, as long as the meaning is clear (i.e. Intermediate proficiency or above is a useful guideline.)

We want to eliminate barriers to participation of minority groups and those who are underrepresented. For this reason, we should not devalue contributions that are
written in English other than that which is standardized.
As many of our members and colleagues are utilizing English as an additional language, and we value the voices of those in a variety of contexts, we want to be inclusive of opportunities to participate. Proposals by those writing in English as an additional language should not be penalized for occasional errors due to language proficiency, as long as the meaning is clear (i.e. Intermediate proficiency or above is a useful guideline.

We want to eliminate barriers to participation of minority groups and those who are underrepresented. For this reason, we should not devalue contributions that are written in English other than that which is standardized.
Now we come to the third question, on rating differently proposals written by men and women. At first glance this question may seem superfluous. After all, the review process is blind. Reviewers don’t know who is writing the proposal, so gender bias (not that we’re biased) isn’t an issue, is it?

Reflection 3

• Would you rate proposals by women differently than proposals by men?
Actually, it may well be. A working paper published by the National Bureau of Economic Research in April 2019 found that female applicants for Gates Foundation grants received lower scores than males in blinded reviews. Why? The authors, Julian Kolev, Yuly Fuentes-Medel, and Fiona Murray posit that differences in communication style, specifically in what the authors refer to as broad and narrow words, accounts for the discrepancy. Critically, women’s use of “narrow words” actually correlated with lower scores AND better research results. While this study is based on what the authors term a “unique setting,” it provides a cautionary note for all of us about implicit bias.
This question on gender bias was intended to highlight the concept that all of us have unconscious attitudes and stereotypes which affect our understandings, actions, and decisions, including on the rating of proposals. What associations do you have about race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, language, and religious affiliation, to mention a few identities which may become evident in proposals that you read or which may be the topics of proposals? By being as transparent as possible with ourselves, we can become better and fairer reviewers.
We all have biases. If you would like to become more aware of yours, please see the links below this video or in the PDF version of this training. These include an introductory video clip from the PBS program POV, “Implicit Bias: Peanut Butter, Jelly, and Racism,” which defines and explains unconscious bias.

Project Implicit is a collaboration among researchers who are investigating social cognition that is outside of conscious awareness and control. The 14 associated Implicit Association Tests gauge biases including based on race, age, and obesity.

The remaining links are to articles about the role of implicit bias in the classroom and at work and include suggestions for recognizing and reducing the impact of bias on students and colleagues.
In *Culturally proficient leadership*, Terrell and Lindsey describe a continuum of cultural proficiency within the academic environment, from cultural destructiveness – leadership which seeks to eliminate others’ cultures – at one end, to cultural proficiency, or leading as an advocate of serving the educational needs of cultural groups, at the other.

If we conceptualize culture broadly and include the various identities and communities within TESOL, it is easy to see that we may fall at different places along the spectrum, depending on the topic of a given proposal.

It is very possible to be competent – knowledgeable and inclusive of others – with regard to sexual orientation, but precompetent – or simply knowing that we don’t know – on how learning differences affect students- and blind, or unaware, on issues facing non-native English speakers within TESOL.

If we are honest with ourselves, we may even find that there are experiences and perspectives which make us uncomfortable or to which we are antagonistic.

For a more detailed discussion of the characteristics associated with cultural
competence, please see the link below this video or in the PDF.
If you are assigned a proposal that is outside of your expertise, including your cultural competence or proficiency, or that makes you uncomfortable for any reason, simply ask your strand coordinators to reassign that proposal so that it can be reviewed by someone with the appropriate background. You do not need to provide a detailed explanation of the reason for your request.
One of the goals of the Convention is to allow attendees to explore new or alternative ways of thinking, doing, and being as TESOL professionals and to have conversations on issues which may, at times, be sensitive or controversial.

We believe we must explore not only academic controversies but those which touch our lives and the lives of our students and our broader communities by discussing issues of identity, marginalization and privilege, language use, policies, and practices.

At the same time, we want to ensure that all presentations at the annual Convention are facilitated in a professional and skilled manner.

To this end, we ask that you review proposals within your areas of expertise using the rubric and identify those which merit additional review because of the potential sensitivity of the topic or approach.
Example 1

Proposal Title: “ESL Students’ Responses to Racial Name-Calling”

Let’s say you review a proposal with the title “ESL Students’ Responses to Racial Name-Calling.” The reference in the title to negative labeling of students indicates that this presentation includes content that should be reviewed closely to ensure that the session is presented with an awareness of the cultural and historical context of the terms. This proposal should be marked for further review.
Let’s say you review a proposal with the title “ESL Students’ Responses to Racial Name-Calling.” The reference in the title to negative labeling of students indicates that this presentation includes content that should be reviewed closely to ensure that the session is presented with an awareness of the cultural and historical context of the terms. This proposal should be marked for further review.
In other cases, the proposal may need to be considered in its entirety to determine whether it requires further review.

In this example, a proposal describes a collaborative effort between a local refugee organization and a school district. If the proposal focuses on an effort to increase student access to community resources, it may not require an additional review. However, if the focus is on religious-based bullying refugee students are encountering, the proposal should be marked for further review.
Because decisions on the appropriateness of a proposal topic is rooted in reviewers’ own personal and professional cultural contexts, it is not possible to provide a complete list of instances where additional review is merited. Strand coordinators can provide guidance on specific situations. However, here are some general guidelines.

Please mark the “Additional Review” box on the review form if a proposal examines issues surrounding identity, including but not limited to national, racial, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, linguistic, and religious identity.

Likewise, proposals that include generalizations, stereotypes, and “us” vs. “them” and othering language should be selected for further review, even if these are examined within a research or academic framework.

Proposals which show evidence of deficit thinking should also be marked for review.
Guidelines

- Any proposal which may appear insensitive or offensive

If a proposal approaches a topic in any manner which you, as a reviewer, find may be insensitive or even offensive, please check the “additional review” box.
When to Contact SC/ASC

• If you are uncomfortable with the topic or approach of a particular proposal

• If you recognize a bias which prevents you from reviewing a proposal fairly

• If a proposal is outside of your professional expertise

As a reminder, if you are assigned a proposal which makes you uncomfortable because of your personal beliefs or if the proposal is outside of your professional expertise, please contact your SC or ASC to have the proposal reviewed by someone else.
Once proposals are assigned you will need to log into the abstract management system to complete your reviews. This section of the training provides information on the system and the different parts of the proposal. You may want to refer to the materials in the Call for Proposals for details and to see how proposal writers were guided when submitting their proposals.
The email you receive will include a link to the abstract management system. Click on it and log in. If you have difficulty logging in which cannot be resolved using the password and user name links, please contact support@sierrabay.net for assistance.
Once you log into the system, you should see a menu on the left. Click My Reviews to see a list of your assigned proposals on the right. At the top, you will see a legend of the icons used in front of each assigned proposal.
Once you log into the system, you should see a menu on the left. Click My Reviews to see a list of your assigned proposals on the right. At the top, you will see a legend of the icons used in front of each assigned proposal.
Click on an assigned proposal and the central panel will populate with information on that proposal. This central panel includes two blue bars that define the Submission section (at the top with information on the proposal) and the Review section (at the bottom, where you will rate and comment on the proposal).
The proposal itself begins in the middle of the submission panel.
Now let’s look at each of the elements listed in the section for proposals.

First, there is the title. Titles are a maximum of ten words, and may include approved acronyms, which can be found in the Call for Proposals. Titles need to inform convention attendees and attract their attention, so, they should be descriptive, concise, and interesting. As a reviewer, consider the following questions: Does the title accurately communicate the session content as far as you can tell from the summary and description? Is the title engaging? Is it limited to ten or fewer words?
Next is the proposal’s context. The context choices are English as a Second (or other) language, a foreign language, or an international language, bilingual or multilingual education, and all contexts. The writer’s selected context should be appropriate for the session in the summary and description.
Proposal writers may select up to two settings. As you read a proposal, keep in mind whether the setting or settings are appropriate for the proposal. The list of settings includes Early Childhood, primary school, secondary school, Academic English Programs, Adult Education, Graduate and Post-Graduate Academic and Professional Programs, International Teaching Assistantships, Intensive English Programs and Private Language Teaching Programs, and Tutoring. Please refer to the Call for Proposal materials for more information on the different settings.
The session focus indicates whether a presentation is oriented towards practice, research, concepts, or policy. You will use this information when evaluating the effectiveness of the summary and description. Again, more information is located in the Call for Proposals materials.
The Convention offers a variety of presentation formats, each with a time limit and expected numbers of presenters. This information is useful in evaluating whether the proposed session is appropriate for the type of session selected. Types of sessions are: Dialogue, Panel Discussion, Poster Session, Presentation, Teaching Tip, and Workshop. Again, more detailed information on each is available in the Call for Proposals.
The next field is the strand.

The term “strand” refers to narrowly defined content areas of inquiry and practice and is used to facilitate the proposal submission and review process. As a reviewer, your concern is: does this proposal fit the designated strand? You may encounter strong proposal submissions that do not seem to align with the designated strand. In this case, please indicate this by checking the appropriate box at the top of the review section of the abstract system.
The abstract system also provides the expected number of participants that a submitter anticipates may attend a session. This information is used for scheduling of accepted sessions and may be disregarded when rating proposals.
The next two areas are the session summary and session description.

The **session summary** appears in the program book to help convention attendees choose which sessions to attend. As you read the session summary, attempt to picture whether it would help attendees understand what the session would entail. Session summaries are limited to 50 words.
Unlike the title and session summary, which appear in the Convention Program Book, and apps, the session description is for the reviewers only. In 300 words or less, submitters must describe their proposed session, covering the elements in the rubric. Submitters were encouraged to use the Checklist for Submitters on the Call for Proposals page to ensure they had included information on which their proposal would be evaluated.

As you review, note that the session summary and description should align with the title and all of the other elements comprising the proposal.
At the end of the proposal section (and not visible in the screenshot above) is an optional text field for citations. This area is provided so that submitters can provide citation information for sources referenced in the session description without, in effect, reducing the word limit. Citation format was not prescribed.
Now that you know the format you will see proposals in, let’s take a look at the rubric.
TESOL is very fortunate to receive many outstanding proposals each year – many more, in fact, than can be accepted, due to limitations of time and space. To be fair to all submitters, it is critical that you use the standard rubric to rate each proposal. This rubric is the same for all strands and session types.

**Using the Rubric**

- 1 rubric for all proposals
Using the Rubric

• 1 rubric for all proposals
• Flagging special situations
  – Additional review
  – Disqualification
  – Wrong strand
  – Recusal
  – Other situations

At the top of the rubric is an area to indicate special situations including potentially sensitive topics or content, disqualifications, submission to the wrong strand, and recusals. If a proposal requires additional review because it addresses potentially sensitive topics, check this box, then complete your review.

Other situations do not require you to crate the proposal. Because our initial process is blind, proposals may not identify the presenters or their institutions. Proposals may not promote commercial interests or be plagiarized, and should not be submitted to multiple strands. If a proposal is disqualified for these reasons, mark the disqualification box and select the reason. The proposal does not need to be reviewed.

Each proposal is submitted to a specific strand by those with expertise in that content area. Occasionally, a submitter will select the wrong strand for a proposal. In this case, mark the box for the wrong strand. TESOL does not guarantee that proposals submitted to the wrong strand will be reassigned.

Finally, if you happen to be assigned to your own proposal or to a proposal where you know the submitters (and, therefore, are unable to rate blindly), mark the recusal
box.

These situations cover the majority of issues with reviews which have occurred in the past, but you may encounter a new or different situation. For example, you may have been assigned to review a presentation on preschoolers when you teach at a university and you have no background in the content of the presentation. In all such cases, please alert your SC or ASC as soon as possible for instructions on how to proceed.
Using the Rubric

- 1 rubric for all proposals
- Flagging special situations
- Evaluation criteria and rating scale

The rubric includes six criteria against which all proposals are rated on a 1 to 4 scale with 1 being the lowest score and 4 being the highest. The higher the score, the stronger the proposal. Please read each of the descriptors provided with the rating scale, then select the one which most closely describes the proposal.
The first criterion is the importance of the proposal topic to TESOL and TESOLers. If the proposal addresses an issue of critical importance to our field and to the intended audience as identified by context and setting, it should be rated a 4. At the other extreme, a proposal that is not relevant to TESOLers would be rated a 1. Please remember to base your score on what is in the actual proposal rather than reading into it the writer’s possible intentions.
Every proposal should provide a rationale for the session content that is well-grounded in pedagogy, research, theory, and/or policy. A rating of 4 in this area indicates that the session content is strongly connected to appropriate theory, practice, research, or policy in the field as evidenced, for example, by the use of citations or terminology. A rating of 1 is given to proposals that either neglect to mention a rationale or use theories, practices, research, or policies that are not relevant to the field or to the topic.
The third criterion asks you to evaluate whether a proposal clearly identifies objectives and outcomes for participants and educational settings. It may be useful to consider the following questions: Does the proposal discuss a future plan of action, proposed solution, and procedures for next steps? What practical applications or implications does the session content have for the potential audience? and How would this session impact or benefit the TESOL field and professionals?

A 4 rating in this area means that the proposal has very clear, specific, and highly relevant outcomes and implications. A rating of 1, on the other hand, indicates that the proposal does not provide participant outcomes and practical implications for the audience.
The next area asks reviewers to examine whether there is a clear link between the content of the session and how it will be presented. These will vary depending on the session type and focus. Please note that the details for the session types occupy a lot of visual space, but that the criterion, at the top, states that “the proposal provides a clear, coherent overview of the session plan.” In addition to the session types which are listed, the session focus is important in rating this area.
As you make your assessment, you should consider the focus of the session: Is it practice- or pedagogy-oriented? In this case, does the proposal present a clear description of the teaching tasks, strategies, and/or techniques to be introduced in the session? Does the proposal show how the tasks or techniques address a teaching gap, need, or goal? and Does the proposal outline how the content will be presented?
Content & Session Focus

- Practice- or pedagogy-oriented
- Research-oriented

Is the session research-oriented? If so, does the proposal present a clear description of the research design? Does there appear to be a clear link between the research design and research questions? Does the proposal clearly indicate the overall findings of the research? and Does the proposal outline how the content will be presented?
For conceptually-oriented sessions, you will want to consider whether the proposal presents an argument that synthesizes existing practice, theory, and/or research, whether it presents a novel interpretation of a theoretical perspective, claim, or idea, and whether it outlines how the content will be presented.
Finally, if a proposal is for a policy-oriented session, you will want to consider the following questions: Does the proposal present a clear description and assessment of the policy under scrutiny? Does the proposal present a clear description of the method, evidence, and justification for action? Does the proposal present a discussion with suggestions for a call to action or reform? and Does the proposal outline how the content will be presented?
After considering the description of the session in terms of focus and type, determine the rating using the four descriptors.
The fifth criterion asks reviewers to evaluate whether the session type chosen by proposal writers is appropriate for the proposal.

A rating of 4 indicates the proposal is clearly appropriate with regard to the session length, content, and delivery method. A 1 indicates that the proposal is inappropriate in terms of length, content, and delivery methods. A session with a poor rating in this area might include too much content for the allotted time or focus on a delivery method at odds with the session type, such as a presentation format for a workshop.
Finally, we come to the overall recommendation for the proposal. In this area, you are asked to examine the overall writing style, content, and scope of a proposal as indicators of the likely quality of the presentation. Questions to consider when looking at this area are: Is it a well-written proposal in terms of style, content, and scope? Does the writer provide clear connections between the ideas presented? Did the writer proofread their submission?

Reviewers may want to consider writing mechanics and style and how the proposal is crafted. Is this a thoughtful, cohesive, well-written narrative with enough information to help the reviewer determine that the presentation is going to be of good quality?

One of our challenges in TESOL is that we want to include all of the members of the organization and make sure that everyone has equal access to submit a proposal to the convention. Syntax from another variety of World Englishes or a non-native author should NOT be a drawback, but sloppiness should be.
Using the Rubric

• 1 rubric for all proposals
• Flagging special situations
• Evaluation criteria and rating scale

Please keep in mind this general information as you complete the strand-specific training for reviewers, including practice ratings.
When to Contact SC/ASC

- Any questions about the rubric or its application

Inevitably, questions may arise about the rubric or ratings. Instead of taking a guess, please reach out to your SC or ASC. Receiving a fair review of a proposal can be important to a colleague’s professional career. Learning about questions and issues that arise also help TESOL improve its review process.
As you complete your review, you will find two text fields for comments. One, for the proposal submitter, is required. The other, for coordinators and TESOL staff, is optional and may include questions you have about the proposal.

Your strand-specific training may include additional information on commenting to submitters. In this general training, we will focus on a few tips and concerns.
The goal of providing feedback is to help submitters better understand the review process and encourage future submissions. There are several things to keep in mind.

Writing Helpful Comments
Writing Helpful Comments

• Collegial tone

First, please remember that you are responding to a professional colleague. Keep the tone collegial and use language appropriate in professional communications. Consider how you would feel if you received the comment from an anonymous peer and edit appropriately.
Next, provide specific and concrete feedback that is tied to the rubric. Writing “This is a great proposal!” is none of these three. Writing “The step-by-step plan provided in the session description was helpful in envisioning the session” is. “I had a hard time understanding this proposal” isn’t helpful, but pinpointing the difficulty and suggesting a solution is – “I found a number of typographical errors which distracted me from focusing on the content of the proposal. It might be helpful to ask a colleague to proofread future submissions.”
Writing Helpful Comments

- Collegial tone
- Specific, concrete, and tied to rubric
- Avoid assumptions

Please avoid making assumptions about the writer, including training in proposal writing and language background. Comments such as “You should attend a session on writing proposals” or “Have a native English speaker read your proposals before submitting” are not appropriate.
In fact, when writing about an issue, use “I” statements, rather than “you” statements.
Sometimes, after reading an outstanding proposal, we want to make the writer aware of our enthusiasm. Please remember that scores are one factor in proposal acceptance and that your ratings may not match those of other raters. For these reasons, please do not assume that a proposal will be accepted or rejected. More information on factors affecting acceptance can be found on the Call for Proposals page.

**Writing Helpful Comments**

- Collegial tone
- Specific, concrete, and tied to rubric
- Avoid assumptions
- “I” statements, not “you” statements
- Make no promises

Sometimes, after reading an outstanding proposal, we want to make the writer aware of our enthusiasm. Please remember that scores are one factor in proposal acceptance and that your ratings may not match those of other raters. For these reasons, please do not assume that a proposal will be accepted or rejected. More information on factors affecting acceptance can be found on the Call for Proposals page.
Finally, we value your time and dedication to TESOL. While feedback helps proposal writers, we know it takes time for reviewers to write. There is no expectation that your comments address every aspect of a proposal. We do ask that comments follow the guidelines in this training and any further instructions from strand coordinators.

Writing Helpful Comments

• No length requirement
When to Contact SC/ASC

• Any questions about comments

Your strand coordinators are your resource throughout the review process. Please ask if you have any questions or concerns about commenting on proposals.
Thank you for taking the time to complete this general reviewer training! Please remember to also complete the strand-specific training provided by your coordinators.

Resources for Implicit Bias
- "Implicit Bias: Peanut Butter, Jelly, and Racism," *POV*
- Project Implicit website
- Implicit Association Tests
- "When Implicit Bias Shapes Teacher Expectations," *NEAtoday*
- "Implicit Bias in the Workplace," *Study.com*
- "Avoiding Unconscious Bias at Work," *MindTools*

Resource for Cultural Proficiency Continuum
- "Cultural Competency Continuum-Characteristics"