

**Overview AM Changes for Improving Meeting Quality**

	<b>Change</b>	<b>Reason 1 Better Paper</b>	<b>Reason 2 Better Reviews</b>	<b>Reason 3 Better Audience Experience</b>	<b>Negative Impact on Existing Structure</b>
1	<p>Submitted paper not proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Paper may be final or preliminary paper, but is a paper, not proposal; final paper due by deadline</li> <li>▪ Paper submission for consideration in all session types (paper sessions, roundtables, poster sessions)</li> <li>▪ Symposia papers either final paper or “commentary” paper</li> </ul>	<p>Paper already written</p> <p>Advanced preparation of paper leads to better presentation (consonant with session format goals)</p>	<p>Reviewers have more information on which to render a decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Audience will be less likely to have to listen to presentations on unfinished research</li> <li>▪ Improve coherence of presentation and session</li> <li>▪ Reduce the possibility of presenters not showing up for the sessions</li> </ul>	None
2	<p>Roundtables &amp; posters treated / considered comparable to paper sessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Submitter specifies session type at which willing to present</li> <li>▪ Chair/program committee creates paper, roundtables, poster sessions based on nature of paper and substantive coherence with other papers</li> </ul>	<p>Paper already written</p> <p>Advanced preparation of paper leads to better presentation (consonant with session format goals)</p>	<p>Reviewers have more information on which to render a decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Roundtables and posters can go into greater depth and audience can participate</li> <li>▪ Moderator will keep presentations brief and on-time and facilitate discussion among presenters in roundtables and engage other attendees</li> </ul>	None
3	<p>Voluntary submission to central repository</p>	<p>Better incentive for authors to complete and post in online repository high quality papers</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ After attending session, member can request full papers for sessions that are of interest; can also experience first-hand the benefits of ease of access to papers through an online paper repository</li> </ul>	None
4	<p>a) Non-deliberating review panels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Advanced selection of reviewers of quality (based on criteria of excellence and inclusiveness) committed to serve; program chairs and VPs/SIG Chairs review final composition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review panels comprised of qualified reviewers</li> <li>▪ Reviewers with more understanding and investment in the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ More productively and efficiently evaluate spectrum of papers—from excellent to poor papers</li> <li>▪ Ensure sufficient number of qualified reviewers in advance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Makes for more efficient review process for Program/Section Chairs and allows for more time to develop/plan cohesive paper sessions and roundtables as well as structured poster sessions</li> </ul>	None

	<p>(accountability and transparency)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Panel reviewers do a baseline number of reviews to be determined by unit</li> <li>▪ Three reviews of papers</li> </ul> <p>b) Grad students may be included in review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Add-on reviewer(s)</li> <li>▪ Expertise of grad student will inform program chair/committee decisions but review not included in numerical score; included with reviews provided to submitter as graduate student review</li> <li>▪ Under exceptional circumstances and at discretion of the program chair, graduate students may be added as one of the three reviewers</li> <li>▪ Grad student training sessions at AERA meeting by AERA and/or units interested in student reviewers</li> </ul> <p>c) Clusters of small units (e.g., SIGs) may combine to create review panels</p> <p>d) Conflict of interest policies observed</p>	<p>process more likely to select quality papers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ More thorough review to ensure acceptance of high quality papers</li> </ul>	<p>of the submission deadline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased accountability and transparency of process</li> <li>▪ Broad &amp; diverse pool of well qualified reviewers</li> <li>▪ Minimize politics and ideology in review process</li> <li>▪ Minimize conflicts</li> <li>▪ Greater inter-rater reliability</li> <li>▪ Build capacity for reviewing in graduate students while having submitters benefit from graduate students' reviews and expertise</li> </ul>		
5	<p>1000 session model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Limit sessions to 1,000 paper or symposium sessions</li> <li>▪ Maintain maximum number of participants for placement in roundtables or poster sessions</li> <li>▪ Give unit chairs discretion to determine the use of posters and roundtables based on willingness of accepted participants to be in these session types</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Symposia more competitive and more broadly attended</li> <li>▪ Paper sessions more thematic and broadly attended</li> <li>▪ Roundtables have richer discussions</li> <li>▪ Poster sessions can go into work more in depth</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Focused sessions</li> <li>▪ Fewer concurrent sessions</li> <li>▪ More opportunity to engage in meaningful discussion and networking with more than one researcher on a topic</li> </ul>	None
6	<p>Disability access enhancement per SIG letter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chairs to remind presenter to use microphone</li> <li>• Accept recommendations of SIG re: disability issues</li> <li>• Use disability access principles to choose rooms &amp; hotels</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disabled attendees will be able to participate more fully</li> <li>▪ Power Point presentations being more readable can benefit all attendees</li> </ul>	None

7	Shorten deadline for submission of papers (e.g., July 15 deadline)		Reviews will take place earlier, before start of fall semester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Easier planning for travel and to link attendance with program interests</li> <li>▪ Shift program committee work earlier in year</li> </ul>	None
8	Chair information form for each session; to be completed online immediately following the Annual Meeting (see chair info form)			Evaluation of prior processes intended to improve quality of paper	None
9	Attendee evaluation form for sessions; sample design: spiral sampling. Time & slot 1 day use optical scan sheet for responses			Evaluation of prior processes intended to improve quality of paper and quality of sessions	None
10	Post annual survey questions relating to possible publication of prior AERA presentations & role of feedback from session or revisions			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall measure of redesigns of AERA meeting improvements</li> <li>▪ Evaluation of presentation experience for scholars' professional development and subsequent publication</li> </ul>	None