



JALT2026 SUBMISSION REVIEWER GUIDE



JALT2026 Conference Proposal Reviewer Guide

JALT2026 Conference Proposal Reviewer Guide	1
Abstract author anonymity and citations.....	2
The Structured Proposal Format.....	2
Proposal sections	2
The Rating Scale.....	3
JALT2026 Proposal Review Rubric	4
Rubric Sections.....	4
1. Title	4
2. Relevance	5
3. Contribution/Research questions	5
4. Content/Method	5
5. Outcomes/results	6
6. References.....	6
7. Organization: Does the proposal follow the specified format?	7
8. Clarity.....	7
Feedback to Authors	8

Dear JALT2026 submission reviewers, we are now ready to begin the process of reviewing presentation proposals for this year's JALT International Conference. We will continue to use the Indico system from last year's conference, with some changes to the procedures to try to make the review process less burdensome. You will receive a list of abstracts to review. Each abstract will be identified by the track (i.e. the content area), followed by the submission ID number. For example, *ALL: 65* refers to submission #65 in the ALL (Accessibility in Language Learning) track.

You can access the reviewing area from this link:

<https://events.jalt.org/event/73/abstracts/reviewing/>

That link will show you a list of all submission tracks. Clicking on the track title will open the list of all submissions within that track. Although you can access all the submission in each track, we only require you to review the submissions assigned to you. However, you are welcome to review additional submissions if you wish to do so. If you do wish to review additional submissions, please give priority to those with three reviews or fewer and ignore those with four or more reviews.

Abstract author anonymity and citations

In cases where you recognize who the author is, please let me know and I will assign a different reviewer. In cases where an author has included **identifying information** (such as a research grant number), please send me the details of the offending information.

There is an abstract section to references, which should be in APA format. **Citations in the proposal should be written in such a manner as to not identify the author.** Provided the identity of the proposal author is not obvious from the reference, authors can include their own names in the reference list. Authors can cite their own works in the third person (i.e. Smith, 2024, rather than Author, 2024) if that helps preserve anonymity. This is a matter of judgement in many cases but, if authors violate anonymity (for example by naming the title of a book that they wish to promote), please contact me with the proposal number at: conf-program@jalt.org

The Structured Proposal Format

Submissions follow a formally structured format that is intended to help authors submit clear and complete proposals and help reviewers make fair decisions quickly. Proposals can be for research or practice-oriented presentations or forums. The structured format is intended to help reviewers determine if a research project is completed and results have been reported, and whether practice-oriented submission authors can provide concrete details of what they intend to demonstrate.

Proposal sections

The structured proposal has **six sections**. In Indico, it is not possible to use a different proposal format for research and practice-oriented submissions (or for JALT Junior). All proposals must fit the same format. Therefore, slightly different content is expected for sections 3, 4, and 5 for research and practice-oriented submissions.

	Practice-oriented Submission	Research Submission
Section 1:	Title	
Section 2:	Relevance	
Section 3:	Contribution	Research questions
Section 4:	Content	Method
Section 5:	Outcomes	Results
Section 6:	References	

Section 1: Title. What the presentation will be about. Conference attendees are often short of time and do not have time to research the details of all the presentations available. The title is an essential part of appealing to an audience.

Section 2: Relevance. The basis of the presentation, citing published literature on previous research and/or established practice in the field of language education. Why is the presentation relevant and important?

Section 3: Contribution. An explicit statement of the aims of the presentation. What need does the presentation address?

Research questions. Explicit research questions that are relevant and can be answered by the research.

Section 4: Content. How will the workshop be conducted?

Method. How was the research conducted?

Section 5: Outcomes. What will the audience learn about classroom practice?

Results. What are the relevant **research findings** and their significance?

Section 6: References. This is not a required section. The research section lists the published material used to explain the background and content/method. Although authors can leave this section empty, they are advised to provide references to support their proposal and the quality of references **is scored** as part of the review.

The Rating Scale

The rubric uses a **4-point scale of 0 to 3**. Please think of the scale in terms of evaluations from A to D, as follows:

- 3 points** **A** Unqualified acceptance: Any weaknesses or omissions are minor.
- 2 points** **B** Qualified acceptance: There are notable weaknesses or omissions, but not sufficient to reject the submission.
- 1 point** **C** Qualified rejection: Although the submission has merit, the weaknesses or omissions are serious enough to justify rejection.
- 0 points** **D** Unqualified rejection: The weaknesses or omissions are such that the submission has little merit and should not be considered for inclusion in the conference.

JALT2026 Proposal Review Rubric

The scoring rubric is intended to focus on the **specific content** of the proposal. Each rubric item should be considered independently, and the score only reflects the relevant section of the submission. Proposals, where unclear writing make the **content difficult to understand**, should still be assigned lower scores, but persuasive writing should not be allowed to compensate for lack of content. In particular, **please do not allow strength in one area to compensate for weakness in another**.

Note that the **reference section is included** as an item in the rubric. The purpose of this is to allow authors to demonstrate that they are familiar with developments in the field. Because JALT receives submissions on a very wide range of topics and for both research and practice-oriented proposals, the quality of the references **should be judged against the purpose of the submission**. For research submissions, peer-reviewed journal articles should be favored, but for a presentation on public policy, news reports on government policy or the websites of government ministries may be more appropriate. Blogs from well-known and authoritative experts may often be appropriate, but many internet sources are untrustworthy so please consider whether the references are appropriate and of suitable quality to support the proposal.

Rubric Sections

1. Title

Is the title directly related to the content? Will **conference attendees** be able to understand the purpose of the presentation from the title?

Rating	Score	
D	0	The title gives little or no indication of the content of the presentation.
C	1	The title is related to the content but does not give a clear indication of what the audience should expect.
B	2	The title is related to the content of the presentation but may not fully inform the audience of what to expect.
A	3	The title is clearly related to the content and will usefully inform the audience about what to expect.

2. Relevance

The proposal should reflect **familiarity with current practice, theory, and/or research**. The assumptions, premises, and/or empirical design upon which the proposal is based should be sound and understandable by a reader with only general knowledge of the field.

Rating	Score	Background
D	0	Little or no relevant background is provided and/or the proposal is not based on sound premises.
C	1	The background provided is insufficient to support the proposed submission.
B	2	Relevant and sound background to the proposal is provided but further details would strengthen the submission.
A	3	The background provided is relevant, sound, and sufficient to justify the submission.

3. Contribution/Research questions

Is the **purpose** of the presentation **clearly described** and **relevant** to the field of language learning/education?

Rating	Score	Contribution/Research questions
D	0	No relevant contribution or research question is provided.
C	1	The provided contribution or research question is either insufficiently relevant or too vaguely described to be useful.
B	2	A relevant contribution or research question is provided but more information would be desirable for clarity.
A	3	A clear and relevant contribution or research question is provided and the information provided is sufficient to judge the submission.

4. Content/Method

Is the procedure described in **sufficient detail** that a reader who is unfamiliar with the content area can understand the procedures?

Rating	Score	Content/method
D	0	Little or no information about the content/method of the presentation is provided.
C	1	Insufficient information about the content/method is provided. A reader who is unfamiliar with the content area will not fully understand the procedures.
B	2	Sufficient information about the content/method is provided, but more would be desirable to clarify the procedures for readers who are unfamiliar with the content area.
A	3	All relevant information is provided, a reader who is unfamiliar with the content area will clearly understand the procedures.

5. Outcomes/results

Is the proposed content **explicitly described** and **appropriate** for the required time slot?

Rating	Score	Outcomes/results
D	0	Little or no explicit description of the outcomes or results is provided and/or the required time slot is not appropriate.
C	1	The description of the outcomes or results lacks sufficient detail and/or might be more appropriate for a different time slot.
B	2	Explicit description of the outcomes or results is provided and the time slot is appropriate, but more detail would be desirable.
A	3	A comprehensive explanation of the outcomes or results is provided and the time slot is appropriate.

6. References

Are there sufficient references of **acceptable quality** to support the claims made?

Rating	Score	References
D	0	No references are provided or the references are untrustworthy sources such as unsubstantiated claims from non-experts.
C	1	References are provided but these are insufficient to support the claims made and/or not appropriate, such as research reports that are not relevant or are from non-peer reviewed publications such as departmental bulletins.
B	2	References are provided but are of secondary sources such as literature reviews or introductory textbooks rather than specialized texts or original research.
A	3	High-quality references that are relevant and appropriate to the presentation topic are provided to support the claims made.

7. Organization: Does the proposal follow the specified format?

The content should be **structured** into four sections (sections 2 to 5 of the proposal). Research and practice-oriented proposals use the same generic structure, but the content will differ due to the different nature of the two proposal types.

	Section	Practice Oriented Presentation	Research Presentation
Title	1.	Title	
Content	2.	Background	
	3.	Contribution	Research questions
	4.	Content	Method
	5.	Outcomes	Results
References	6.	References	

Rating	Score	Organization
D	0	The specified format is largely ignored, essential information is missing or not coherently presented.
C	1	The author attempted to follow the specified format but one or more sections are missing essential information.
B	2	The specified format was followed but one or more sections would benefit from additional information.
A	3	The specified format was followed and all sections contained sufficient information to judge the merits of the proposal.

8. Clarity

The proposal should be **clear, concise, and well-organized**. It should have been thoroughly proofread, with no obvious errors.

Rating Score Clarity

D	0	The quality of writing is poor. The proposal is filled with language errors. The proposal appears to have been written hastily with very little time given to proofreading.
C	1	The overall writing quality of the proposal is marginal and obvious errors are present. Multiple areas for improvement related to the clarity, and/or organization of the proposal can be identified.
B	2	The proposal is clearly written with no obvious errors. However, there may be a couple areas where suggestions for improvement to the clarity, and/or organization of the proposal can be made.
A	3	Writing quality is of a high professional standard and is clearly organized.

Feedback to Authors

Reviewers can make comments to submission authors. These are provided to the authors upon request, which only happens in the case of rejection. This is to ensure that only **appropriate and constructive feedback** is provided. To quote long-time JALT member and editor, Greg Rouault, **“when you are giving critical feedback, be kind.”**

However, **any remarks about the concern of plagiarism, the identity of the authors or presenters, or your inability to score a proposal** should be emailed directly and immediately to me, and not be added to the comments.

One final reminder – be sure to include your participation on our committee **on your resume**. One possibility is to include it under a section entitled “Community Service.” A list of reviewers will be included in the conference handbook in November. If you have any difficulties, please do not hesitate to contact me. Again, I would like to thank you for volunteering for this job. Your time is greatly appreciated.

Best regards,

Trevor Holster

JALT 2026 International Conference Program Chair

conf-program@jalt.org