Australasian Society for Intellectual Disability – Research to Practice 2012 Conference
Review Guidelines & Evaluation Criteria

Important dates

18 January 2012	Call for Papers open
30 March 2012	Call for Papers close
April 2012	Peer review of all submissions
25 May 2012	Notification of accept, decline, resubmission or change of status sent
8 June 2012	Deadline to receive resubmitted abstracts
4 June 2012	Early Bird registrations open
29 June 2012	Programme timetable completed
7 September 2012	All presenters must be registered and paid

General Guidelines

The goal of the peer review process is to ensure that all papers presented meet minimum professional standards and reflect careful preparation in advance. The peer review is intended to be as objective and inclusive as possible. The abstract will need to indicate the purpose of the paper, some background, what was done, what was found, and the significance of the findings/outcomes.

Review process

- Authors must submit abstracts via the online system by Friday 30 March 2012. This date allows for resubmission if necessary.
- A peer review process will be used.
- Each abstract will be reviewed within the context of the criteria below.
- Submission of an abstract does NOT constitute inclusion in the conference programme. Authors will be notified of the status of their abstract.
- There will be one opportunity for resubmission, and Review panel members are instructed to rate abstracts either 'accept' or 'decline', with no possibility for further revision and resubmission.
- All accepted abstracts will be published in the conference programme only. There will be no post-conference proceedings.

Resubmission process

- Authors of abstracts notified with the opportunity to resubmit, will work directly with the reviewers.
- Reviewers & authors will have a 2 week window to work towards a resubmission.
- Reviewers will advise the conference organiser of the outcome of resubmission.

Evaluation Criteria

A 4 point rating scale will be applied
1. Unacceptable/resubmit
2. Weak/resubmit
3. Strong
4. Very Strong

Criteria for research/academic stream

1. Reflects the conference theme
2. Has a specific title that reflects the content of the paper
3. Explores a research question
4. Substantial evidence for its conclusions
5. Meaningful implications for supporting people with an intellectual disability
6. Presented to a professional standard

Criteria for practice stream

1. Reflects the conference theme
2. Has a specific title that reflects the content of the paper
3. Identifies an issue/problem and proposes a solution (complete or partial) or an alternative to current thinking
4. Reflects and/or builds on current theory and/or best evidence approaches
5. Meaningful implications for supporting people with an intellectual disability
6. Presented to a professional standard

Criteria for lived experience stream

1. Reflects the conference theme

2. Has a specific title that reflects the content of the paper
3. Explains:
   - what we did
   - how we did it
   - what we found
   - what it means