Criteria for Rating NASW/Texas Conference Abstracts
Instructions for Submitting and Reviewing Proposals

Please allot plenty of time to review each proposal and complete all the questions on the rating form. To assist you in doing so, we have provided guidelines which we hope will allow everyone submitting and reviewing to interpret the criteria for rating in a consistent manner.

1. Does the Proposal present clear and effective opportunities for attendees to develop competency and build or enhance practice (micro, mezzo, macro) skills?

Explanation: Consistent with the CSWE educational standards, it is our goal that social workers continue to learn and improve upon their skills. So, we prefer that proposals be specific in identifying ways for social workers to become more competent through their ability to develop increased practice skills (micro, mezzo, or macro.) To be sure that participants obtain what they think they are getting in a session particularly when it comes to developing skills, there needs to be consistency (matching) in a proposal between what is described and the learning objectives.

2. Is the Proposal grounded in the social work knowledge base?

Explanation: Proposals must be grounded in evidence demonstrating that information provided, and interventions used are based on the best available evidence- this is ethical practice (micro, mezzo, or macro.) The social work knowledge base can be broad including theory and knowledge that comes from other disciplines, but the proposal must demonstrate how the information presented is applicable to social workers. It is also expected that the author(s) articulate the alignment between the Code of Ethics (revised in 2017), and/or NASW practice standards with the proposal topic. In-text citations or a References list in 6th edition, APA format, must be included in the proposal.

3. Is the Proposal well-organized and related to the objectives which are clearly stated?

Explanation: A well-organized proposal that has a logical flow to the topic and objectives is likely to produce a presentation that will be well done and flow in such a way that attendees will gain much from the presentation. Are the objectives clearly stated? Does the proposal content refer to the objectives? Does the proposal demonstrate a progression of information and/or activities that will lead attendees to develop the skills described within the objectives? For example, if ethical content will be delivered the summary and proposal must explicitly reference what ethical content will be discussed.

4. Is the Proposal timely and relevant?

Explanation: Does the proposal describe how it fits in with trends/current issues within the social work practice environment or in the literature? Is the proposal keeping up with what social workers should be staying on top of in order to remain competent and relevant in their own work? Do you agree that the proposal does fit in with trends you are seeing in practice (micro, mezzo, or macro) or in the literature?

_______ Does not fit criteria but is noteworthy. Please select this option if you’d like the program committee to review this proposal and consider the possibility of working with the presenter to make improvements; there is something noteworthy about the proposal. **Please note the qualities about the submission you find appealing in the Coordinators Tracking spreadsheet.

Overall Recommendation:

This recommendation is important because it does allow the program committee to review proposals in a different
manner regardless of their overall score based on what the content of the proposal is that makes it a high, medium, or low priority.

_____ Accept-High priority          _____ Accept-Medium priority

_____ Accept-Low priority           _____ Reject