**PME-NA 2018 Worksheet for Reviewing Poster Proposals**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title of Proposal: | | | | | | |
| Criteria | | Score (5 is high) | | | | |
| **Choice of Problem or Question** | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| *Is it clear what issue the proposal addresses?*  *Is the issue the proposal addresses an important one?*  *Does the research build on and move an area of mathematics education forward?* | | | | | | |
| **Relationship to PME-NA 2018 Conference Theme** | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| *Does the work relate to the conference theme Looking Back, Looking Ahead: Celebrating 40 Years of PME-NA?* | | | | | | |
| **Response to Issue** | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| *Does the proposal present a response to the issue it raises?*  *Does the approach taken to responding to this issue seem sound?*  *Would a poster describing the work be likely to benefit those who would see it?*  *Note: Since poster proposals are only 1-page in length, questions about a study’s theoretical framework, mode of inquiry, rigor of analysis, and interpretation are collapsed into this category about the response to the issue communicated in the single page proposal.* | | | | | | |
| **Quality of Writing** | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| *Does the proposal conform to the formatting style for the conference? Does the proposal display high quality writing?*  *Does the proposal communicate ideas effectively?* | | | | | | |
| **Recommendation** | Definitely Accept | Accept in an alternate format | | | Reject | |
| **Comments for the author(s) to improve the quality of their work.** | | | | | | |
| *Please provide useful feedback on how the author(s) might make improvements as they move forward with the work described in the proposal. In the case of acceptance, please make suggestions for how the authors might best capture their ideas in poster form.* | | | | | | |