Annual Meeting Submission Guidelines

Please follow the guidelines below to prepare your submission and ensure a smooth review process. We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to your proposal.

Conference Theme and Strands

This year's theme, "**ConnectED to Lead: Innovation and Impact,**" focuses on collaboration to develop solutions and ideas that create meaningful impact. Content should address one of the Annual Meeting's four strands:

- Strand I: Advancing Innovation and Impact
- Strand II: Education Policy and Advocacy
- Strand III: Deepening the Impact of Education Research
- Strand IV: Prioritizing Opportunity for All

Who should submit

As the leading voice on educator preparation, AACTE welcomes thought leaders from higher education and PK-12 communities to submit a proposal for consideration in the 2026 Annual Meeting program. Additionally, AACTE strongly encourages doctoral students pursuing an Ed.D. or Ph.D. to share their perspective on addressing current issues and provide innovative ways to approach that have yet to be considered in educator preparation. Individuals from all educational fields are invited to bring their research and practice to the Annual Meeting. AACTE recognizes and values diverse voices to foster innovation and advance the profession.

Important Dates

The following schedule indicates key milestones for the call cycle. Please note that the dates are subject to change.

- Apr 30 - May 30   Call for Reviewers Site Open+
- May 27 - Jul 7   Call for Proposals Portal Open+*
- Jul 22 - 26, 2024   Reviewers Selected and Notified
- Jun 30 - Jul 11   Reviewer Training *(Required)*
- Jul 14 - Aug 1   Peer Review Period
- Aug 11 – Oct 10   Selection Period
- Nov 7   Notification Period
- Nov 18   Slotting Date/Time Announced

+Site closes at 11:59 p.m. Pacific time and submissions will be locked at this time
˙No late proposals will be accepted, and incomplete submissions will be purged from the system.

General Information Needed to Prepare Proposal

- **List of Authors and Main Contact** (Minimum Count 2 – Maximum Count 10 people associated with each submission)
  Please note that the maximum count is dependent on the session type.

  Required: author's first name, last name, and Institution or Organization email address (No Yahoo or Gmail accounts)

  Available Roles:

  - Speaker and Main Contact
  - Main Contact Only
  - Speaker
  - Student Speaker
  - Moderator Only
  - Author (not presenting)
  - Contributor/Collaborator
  - Staff Admin
  - Submitter Only
- *We do ask if authors are associated with an institution that is an active AACTE member.*

- **Proposal Title** - Titles should not be in all UPPER case or all LOWER case. Sentence case is preferred. The total length of the title should be no more than 10 words (75 maximum characters), not including spaces.

- **Primary Audience –** Please indicate the (main) target audience for whom the submission is directed.
  - Deans
  - Faculty/Staff (mid-career)
  - Faculty/Staff (early-career)
  - Students

- **Content Level** – Please indicate the content level of this submission as it pertains to the indicated audience.
  - Introductory (Audience has little or no knowledge of/experience with topic)
  - Intermediate (Audience has some knowledge of /experience with topic)
  - Advanced (Audience has deep knowledge of/experience with topic)

- **Short Abstract -** Describe why a conference attendee should attend this session and what they will gain; value-added. If selected, this content will be used in marketing materials. (Word Count: 75-200)

- **Statement of the issue** - Clearly state the issue/focus of your presentation. Provide relevant background and place the problem in a broader academic context. (Word Count: 55-100)

- **Literature review.** Provide a synthesis of the literature or knowledge base related to your topic; highlight competing hypotheses or major schools of thought. (Word Count: 0-900)

- **Contribution** – Discuss how your work relates to the conference strand and subcategory under which you are submitting the proposal. (Word Count: 200-700)

- **Relevance** – Discuss how your proposal relates to at least two of the following perspectives (Word Count: 200-700):
    - Implications for policy.
    - Using qualitative or quantitative evidence to inform policy or practice.
    - Successful (exemplary) practices.

- **Implication for Action** - Outline what concrete changes, activities, policies, research, or other outcomes can result from this work. (Word Count: 200-700)

- **Design Method** – Describe how you will design the session so that the learner/participant outcomes are achieved. (Word Count: 50-700)

- **Learning Objectives** - Describe what you intend the participants to learn during the session by providing up to four (4) learning objectives that are clear, measurable, and achievable.

Strand Descriptions

Strand I: Advancing Innovation and Impact

Educators are no longer content providers; they are skills-based, student-centered, personalized learning experts. The skills and knowledge that educators need to succeed in the 21st century is changing. Future educators need to be prepared to teach and work in rapidly changing educational landscapes requiring innovative and impactful approaches to education. The Advancing Innovation and Impact strand features proposals that:

1. Address the latest practices and advancements in the field and seek to answer questions that shape the future of teaching and learning.
2. Explore how to attract, prepare, and retain educators, and address the barriers that prevent prospective educators from becoming fully credentialed.
3. Examine educator shortages to ensure a robust pipeline of teachers and administrators exists, while producing high-quality educators from high-quality accredited educator licensure programs.
4. Develop support initiatives which better equip educators to address student needs, adjust to different learning styles, incorporate modern technologies and teaching methods into instruction, and maintain mental health and wellness.

Topics include:
- ✓ workforce development
- ✓ technology integration
- ✓ student support
- ✓ research investment in innovative practices

Application: Proposals in this strand may address one or more of the following questions.

- What are the most innovative approaches to teaching and learning that are currently being used in EPPs and how are these approaches impacting student outcomes?

- What are best practices in recruiting students into high-need areas such as special education?

- How can globalizing the pre-service curriculum standards contribute to a well-rounded, internationally competent teacher?

- How can educators effectively engage with diverse communities and stakeholders to build partnerships and promote positive social impact through education?

- How are EPPs using AI (Artificial Intelligence) /technology tools to enhance the learning of pre-service educators?

- What are effective strategies for fostering collaboration and teamwork among students, and how can these strategies be used to enhance learning outcomes?

- How can we design effective apprenticeships and alternative certification programs to meet the needs of students?

- How are we preparing pre-service educators to support, in collaboration with school-based mental health care providers such as school psychologists, the mental and behavioral health needs of school communities?

Strand II: Education Policy and Advocacy

The Education Policy and Advocacy strand seeks proposals that 1) translate research into policy and practice and provide information of relevant state and federal policies impacting the educator profession and 2) promote public advocacy and civic engagement. Successful advocacy is characterized by long-term relationship-building positioning you as a trusted expert. Examples of engagement may demonstrate establishing and sustaining connections with policy makers, agency leaders, and even the media, while developing alliances with other education stakeholders to support and amplify your message. Proposals should offer strategies and examples to enhance collaboration between education stakeholders and policymakers.

Topics include:

- ✓ academic censorship
- ✓ faculty tenure
- ✓ teacher licensure/ certification
- ✓ critical shortages

- ✓ educator enrollment/ retention
- ✓ teacher induction
- ✓ student and educator mental health
- ✓ school safety

Application: Proposals in this strand may address one or more of the following questions.

Policy Perspective	Advocacy Perspective
What policies address chronic disinvestment in educators, educator preparation, teaching and learning?	How can EPPs and stakeholders advocate for the necessary human and intellectual capital needed to advance the field?
Have legislative actions increased teacher salaries and retention?	How have labor strikes shaped teacher pay legislation in states?
What policies dictate requirements for entry into educator preparation programs and how teachers receive licensure? How do these policies impact the pipeline into the teaching profession?	How can the narrative of the education profession be enhanced through public discourse?
How has state policy influenced academic censorship in PK-20 settings?	How can faculty, educators and stakeholders advocate academic freedom?
What is the role of candidates and teachers as advocates?	How can educators use the power of personal stories to effect change?
Amidst the ongoing school and campus safety concerns, what are the current challenges, solutions, and model policies to ensure the safety of students, educators and faculty in K-12 schools and campus settings?	What efforts and policy opportunities exist to invest in students' social and emotional well-being?
How has politics impacted early childhood education (ECE) policy and practice, and the preparation of ECE teachers?	How can educator preparation programs and stakeholders proactively collaborate with policymakers and elected officials?
How have accreditation policies evolved?	What has been the impact on ensuring quality educational standards in the field?
What policies and strategies have been employed to invest in and sustain a diverse teaching workforce?	How are teacher diversity policies shaping the profession?

Strand III: Deepening the Impact of Education Research

Research in education has tackled significant challenges, driving innovation and transformation in the field. Despite facing reduced funding, limited access to methodological resources and technology, and time constraints, high-quality and innovative education research continues to evolve, addressing the challenges and opportunities for educators, families, and policymakers.

The Deepening the Impact of Education Research strand seeks to address the needs of faculty pursuing educational research and those engaged in research to affect practice by soliciting high-quality proposals that are:

1) contemporary and impactful
2) disseminate new knowledge and resources
3) advance teaching and learning
4) enhance the design, development, improvement and promotion of educator preparation programs
5) grounded in equity and may employ diverse methodologies

We encourage submissions that include community-based research, conceptual papers, empirical studies, peer-reviewed scholarly articles, research briefs, and studies that increase the use of evidence-based practices.

Topics include:
- ✓ research gaps on technology in education
- ✓ addressing the teacher shortage
- ✓ microcredentials
- ✓ trends and implications in state and federal data
- ✓ accreditation
- ✓ assessments
- ✓ AI

Application: Proposals in this strand may address one or more of the following questions.

• What trends do national and state-level data reveal about educator preparation programs, and teaching and learning? • How are Grow Your Own (GYO) programs increasing the number of profession-ready educators for the workforce? • What are the current research gaps on technology in education? How can research on the use of AI in education advance the field? • How can EPPs establish mutually beneficial partnerships with stakeholders, including state and local education agencies, philanthropic entities, and community-based organizations to expand program access, affordability and their reach and impact? • How are accreditation standards impacting education programs and institutions? How are these standards being leveraged for program improvement? • How can faculty obtain funding to test, develop and disseminate innovative approaches to address pressing issues in the field, particularly related to equity?	**Examples of Translating Research Findings into Practical Applications for this Strand:** ▪ Development of needs assessment tool ▪ Implementation of analytical tools for decision support ▪ Establishment of standards and frameworks for a structured approach ▪ Impact evaluation of existing and new technologies ▪ Establishment of career development pipelines ▪ Impact of alternative certifications ▪ Expansion of partnership incentives ▪ Addressing program efficacy and benefits ▪ Influence of socioeconomic, -political, -cultural contexts

Strand IV: Prioritizing Opportunity for All

The Prioritizing Opportunity for All strand seeks proposals that demonstrate a commitment to:
1) preparing diverse and anti-racist educators,
2) recruitment of educators in critical shortage areas,
3) global perspectives in education,
4) inclusive education,
5) equitable engagement of families, and
6) access to high-quality learning environments for all students.

To holistically address diversity, equity and inclusion, educators should consider any community that has been historically and systematically denied access to quality education or communities that have been discriminated in the education system, including but not limited to Black and Brown communities, low-income, migrant, limited-English proficiency, Native, AAPI, disability and LGBTQIA+ communities.

Topics include:
- ✓ family and community partnerships
- ✓ teacher recruitment and retention
- ✓ diversified teaching workforce
- ✓ student diversity
- ✓ global education

Application: Proposals in this strand may address one or more of the following questions:

- How might higher education and PreK-20 educators collaborate with families to cultivate inclusive, equity-centered learning environments in their schools and communities?

- Which practices create the most innovative, authentic, and sustainable partnerships leading to improved retention of teachers from diverse backgrounds?

- How can recent technology and equitable access to technology aid educator preparation programs in recruiting and retaining diverse candidates, as well as preparing all candidates to be a part of an equity-minded teaching workforce?

- What strategies have been employed and successful in establishing and sustaining a diverse teaching profession where the educators reflect the general diverse nature of the students they are teaching?

- What methods can be used to expand public policy and professional learning opportunities that connect research and innovation within educator preparation to address the needs of a diverse workforce and diverse student population?

- What strategies have educator preparation programs implemented (or are planning to implement) that would adjust their practices to accommodate the unique needs of students, schools, accrediting bodies, etc., while maintaining program integrity amidst a cultural climate that discourages diversity, equity and inclusion programs and funding?

- What best practices have educator preparation programs implemented (or are planning to implement) to train teachers and faculty to better understand and implement global perspectives?

Proposal Scorecard Rubric: Proposal submissions will be graded based on the rubric outlined below. Reviewers will rate the proposal on a scale from 1 through 5, for each of the following evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Criteria	Level "5" – Very Strong	Level 4	Level "3" – Average	Level 2	Level "1" – Very Weak
FORMAT Proposal follows the format described in the Call for Proposals, follows standard conventions of written language, and supports the selected Session Type.	The proposal follows the format as described in the Call for Proposals, is well written, and is designed to support the selected Session Type. Though a specific citation style is not required, the proposal is written with conventional research citations when needed.	The proposal follows the format as described in the Call for Proposals and supports the selected Session Type. Although a specific citation style is not required, the proposal is written with conventional research citations when needed.	The proposal follows the format as described in the Call for Proposals and partially supports the selected Session Type. Grammatical or syntax errors impede meaning in one or two sections (I-IV).	The proposal follows the format as described in the Call for Proposals, but it minimally aligns with the selected Session Type. Grammatical and syntax errors impede meaning in one or two sections (I-IV).	Proposal does not follow the requested format as described in the Call for Proposals AND includes multiple grammatical and syntax errors that impede meaning in three or more sections (I-IV). Format of proposal does not align with selected Session Type. Citations, when needed, are not included.
ORGANIZATION Proposal provides a clear description of the conference presentation and is structured cohesively with substantial connections between ideas.	The proposal provides a detailed description of the conference presentation. Proposal includes sufficient detail for each part of the presentation and to all four sections (I-IV) on the submission form in the Call for Proposals. Ideas are connected seamlessly and cohesively to provide structure and meaning.	The proposal describes what will occur during the presentation. Proposal includes responses to all four sections (I-IV) on the submission form as described in the Call for Proposals. Ideas are connected in a way that provides structure or meaning.	The proposal describes what will occur during the presentation, but 2 or 3 ideas are minimally connected, or the description lacks clarity in one area.	The proposal lacks sufficient detail in order to understand what will occur during more than one section of the presentation. Three or more sections (I-IV) are minimally addressed.	The proposal lacks enough detail to understand all sections of the presentation. Ideas are not connected. Structure and meaning are absent.

Evaluation Criteria	Level "5" – Very Strong	Level 4	Level "3" – Average	Level 2	Level "1" – Very Weak
Proposed Title	Title follows the recommended format, conveys the session's content in an interesting way while providing enough information to indicate what the session is about.	Title follows the recommended format and-conveys the session's content.	Title minimally describes what the session will be about.	Title does not describe the session's content and/or is confusing or unrelated to the proposal.	Title is not included or is too brief to support the presentation's purpose.
Abstract	Abstract follows all guidelines provided in the submission form, is written for the conference attendee and identifies the intended audience, provides expectations for attendees to know what to expect and gain from this session, highlights the topic and main points, and is publication-worthy (free of errors).	Abstract is written for the conference attendee, provides expectations for attendees to know what to expect from this session, highlights the topic or main points, and is publication-worthy.	Abstract provides expectations for attendees to know what the session is about OR provides details of what the audience will gain.	Abstract reads more like a summary instead of written for the intended audience. Abstract does not address what attendees might gain or what they can expect from this session.	Abstract is too brief to be beneficial to the attendee; not publication-worthy. Abstract is minimally related to the session topic.

Evaluation Criteria	Level "5" – Very Strong	Level 4	Level "3" – Average	Level 2	Level "1" – Very Weak
TIMELINESS Proposal is timely; addresses a critical issue in educator preparation and the field and/or directly addresses how the topic aligns with the conference theme and the AACTE Strategic Priorities.	The proposal demonstrates this topic as one of the most critical or problematic current issues for educator preparation and/or PK-12 education and discusses emerging and/or high-demand content, and/or the proposal aligns with the conference theme or more than one of the AACTE's strategic priorities.	The proposal demonstrates this topic or content as important and in high demand, though not emerging. or, the proposal provides evidence that demonstrates new insight or a new way to explore current issues for educator preparation and/or PK-12 education. Or the proposal explores an issue that is relevant to the conference theme or relevant to one of the AACTE's strategic priorities.	The topic presented is a significant current issue for educator preparation or PK-12 education. The proposal provides clear evidence of the need to further explore the current issue or explores an issue or dilemma relevant to one of the strategic priorities.	The topic has been presented often. The proposal does not provide clear evidence of the need to further explore or revisit this tired topic. The topic may be related to the theme, but the proposal does not address the theme or any of the strategic priorities.	The proposal does not appear to address a significant current issue for educator preparation or PK-12 education. The topic or content is not related to the theme and does not explore any of the strategic priorities.
Proposal Rationale: Literature Review, Contribution, Relevance, Implication for Action	The rationale provides a clear analysis and synthesis of the proposed topic or content within current research, is relevant, and explains a detailed contribution to the field while applying research knowledge to practice, if applicable, or describes plans for the application of knowledge. The literature review is well organized and concisely situates the topic within current research.	The rationale provides analysis OR synthesis of the proposed idea within current research and contributes to the field while applying research knowledge to practice, if applicable, or describes plans for applying knowledge. The literature review situates the topic within current research.	The rationale is thorough in one or more areas and demonstrates how it contributes to the field, but a significant application of knowledge to practice is not developed. The literature review partially situates the topic within current research	The rationale is limited to one or more areas and demonstrates how it contributes to the field or applies it to knowledge to practice but neither idea is fully developed. The literature review is unorganized or brief and fails to situate the topic within current research.	The rationale is brief and/or does not apply knowledge to practice. The literature review does not provide evidence-based research or is unrelated to the topic.

Evaluation Criteria	Level "5" – Very Strong	Level 4	Level "3" – Average	Level 2	Level "1" – Very Weak
SIGNIFICANCE Proposal provides conclusions about the focus of the work and the issue in the broader context of educator preparation.	Overall, the proposal raises significant issues, questions, and/or dilemmas about work and its place within the larger context of educator preparation and/or PK-12 education. The proposal considers multiple and/or underrepresented perspectives and communities.	Overall, the proposal raises an issue, question, or dilemma about work and its place within the larger context of educator preparation and/or PK-12 education.	The proposal discusses one or more conclusions about the work's focus and its place in the larger context of educator preparation or PK-12 education.	The proposal lacks a contribution toward significant issues, questions, or dilemmas about work, or the context for the proposal's issue is minimally connected to educator preparation and/or PK-12 education.	The proposal fails to draw conclusions about the focus of the work or its place in the larger context of educator preparation or PK-12 education.
PARTICIPANT OUTCOMES (LEARNING OBJECTIVES) The proposal includes a clear description of participant outcomes.	All learning objectives describe realistic participant outcomes to this proposal and session type. All learning objectives are specific, measurable, and actionable.	Two or more learning objectives describe realistic participant outcomes to this proposal and session type. All learning objectives are specific, but one may include verbs that are not actionable.	Learning objectives are related to the session proposal but may lack description or are non-specific in terms of what participants will be able to do after attending the session.	Learning objectives are unrealistic and inappropriate to the time allotted in the proposal. Two or more learning objectives are not specific, not measurable, or not actionable.	Learning objectives are not provided, unrelated to the proposed presentation, and not written in terms of participant outcomes.

Evaluation Criteria	Level "5" – Very Strong	Level 4	Level "3" – Average	Level 2	Level "1" – Very Weak
SESSION TYPE SELECTION & AUDIENCE ENGAGEMENT Proposal describes an appropriate level of audience interaction in the selected session type to meet learning outcomes.	Proposal provides multiple opportunities for audience engagement, incorporates creative and meaningful opportunities for the audience to meet all of the learning outcomes, and the outcomes are doable with the selected session type.	Proposal provides audience interaction; the learning outcomes are doable with the selected session type and provides an opportunity for the audience to meet two learning outcomes.	Proposal provides opportunities to appropriately engage the audience to meet one or more learning outcomes, but one or two learning outcomes may not be doable with the selected session type.	Proposal provides limited audience interaction to meet learning outcomes or interaction does not align with the selected session type.	Proposal does not provide any evidence of audience interaction and little to no attention to meeting the learning outcomes.

SESSION TYPES

Research to Action (60 minutes): Encourages the audience to consider and discuss practical applications in everyday settings in an interactive way; engages the audience in robust small group discussion.

Scenario Planning (60 minutes): Engages audience to explore possibilities with peer-to-peer discussion and plan their own strategies and tactics in response to the information received; allows time to explore potential or certain changes to implement in own settings.

Case Stories (60 minutes):
Proposal engages the audience with vivid pictures, storyboards, and visuals to bring stories to life; and engages the audience with small or large group discussions about what participants have learned and how they can apply the lessons to their practices.

Roundtable Discussions (30 minutes):
Proposal seeks to discuss the author's work and engage the audience to explore the work specifically and in a larger context. The proposal engages the audience in a way that generates audience feedback and allows the audience to provide critical input to inform the author's next step of development. A significant majority of the time is devoted to interaction with the audience.

Scholarly Papers (30 minutes):
Proposal generates minimal, if any, audience feedback. The audience will engage with the content as the speaker presents the research/ paper. As proposed, the audience will meet the learning objectives, but a Q&A segment is not appropriate for this session type.

Posters:
Proposal engages the audience with vivid pictures, storyboards, and visuals to bring stories to life, and engages the audience in small or large group discussions on what they learned and how to apply the lessons to their practices.