EES Autumn On-line Event 15-16th November 2023
Abstract submission guidelines

General information

EES invites submission of abstracts for presentation in the autumn online event. Please see below details of the event themes and the diverse session modalities for presentations. All Abstracts must be submitted electronically via [Conftool Pro](#) after the **12th of July** and by the specified deadline of 22 **of September** 2023 (Abstracts submitted by fax or by email cannot be accepted). Information on Conftool Pro submission process is set out below.

Abstracts received after the submission deadline of the 22 of September cannot be accepted and therefore will not be considered for the programme.

Submission of an abstract does not guarantee its acceptance. Abstracts will be peer-reviewed according to the criteria set out below (essentially quality, relevance appropriateness and innovation).

Abstracts should be informed by the event thematic scope and topic strands as set out as follows:

Thematic scope

Background: The diagnostic is clear, the world is facing overlapping crises (the new buzzword of the time is 'poly-crises') and we've undeniably come to the end of a model—economic, societal, ecological. Now we need to change, fast. Call it a transformation, a transition, a (R)evolution—a drastic change is unavoidable. What role should evaluation play in this transition? How can our discipline, profession, and community take a decisive and distinct part in the fact changing World? What would it take? At the online European Evaluation Society Conference 2023, we will collectively seek answers to these questions. From sharing experiences of what some of us are already doing (e.g., embedded evaluations of local transition initiatives, using evaluative evidence for advocacy, shifting how we 'value' certain outcomes in our methodology, how we proceed with new forms of data collection and analysis), to collectively imagining and planning for an alternative future, this conference will provide a forum for collective thinking and action.

To structure our reflections, we propose the following three strands:

1) Changing how and what we value: Evaluation's responsibility in defining alternative measures of success

In this strand, we invite both methodological and normative reflections and experiences on evaluation's role and responsibility in establishing, measuring, judging and informing decision-makers and societies about what success looks like. How can we (help) abandon metrics and standards that are harmful for people and the planet? How can we help societies and organizations imagine and put in place alternative norms of success and measurement?

2) Changing how we work: Evaluation models that work

In this strand, we invite practical reflections and experiences on how we can change the way we work, together, with non-evaluators, decision-makers, and the public to contribute not only with knowledge but also in action to a just transition. How do we change our work because of new available methods and approaches, like AI? What evaluation models have proven successful in

facilitating collective change? What does it take to influence people in power? What does it take to conduct transformative evaluations?

3) **Learning from others: Evaluation's role in the *polity***

In this strand, we invite evaluators who've actively collaborated with non-evaluators or have adopted ways of working that transcend evaluation to make a difference for a just transition. Be it journalists, activists, biologists, or humanitarian workers. Who and what has inspired you to transcend your domain of expertise? What models of collective and interdisciplinary practice have worked?

Presenters of accepted abstracts are expected to register for the conference and pay the fee via ConfTool Pro*.* Credit card payments are accepted.

Resubmittal of already submitted abstracts can only be done before the deadline of **the 22 of September 2023.**

Evaluation schedule, notification, and event programme

Peer reviewers will assess the abstracts. To ensure quality, they may suggest changes; propose a different type of presentation or recommend rejection**.**

All abstract authors will be notified via e-mail about the abstract review results **by the 1ˢᵗ of October 2023.**

Accepted abstracts will be included in the Conference programme and published online in the conference programme. **However, only abstracts of presenters who have registered and paid within the given deadline qualify for the above**.

Once a draft programme is constructed, preliminary information about the timing and location of approved submissions will be communicated to presenters. Programme updates will be posted on the EES website.

All presenters of accepted abstracts are responsible for all aspects of their presentations including PowerPoint presentations as appropriate. The online platform will be used for delivery and presenters will be provided with instructions on the use of the tool and each presentation will have a technical facilitator to ensure the smooth running of the platform. Presenters are also accountable for delivering their presentations within time constraints and along lines agreed with the session chair.

Authors are encouraged to consider working up their abstracts into a paper for possible inclusion in the Sage Journal, Evaluation and to this end are invited to tick the box on the submission page of Conftool Pro indicating permission for consideration for the Journal.

Abstract formatting

- **All abstracts must** be written in English.
    - (Should your abstract be accepted for a presentation you must be able to give your presentation in English and answer the questions from the audience.)
- **Abstracts should** contain no more than **500 words**. The system will automatically let you know whether or not you have complied with this rule.
- **Tables and figures** cannot be inserted.

Requirements for different submission types

The Conftool Pro system will ask for the following details to be specified during the online submission process:

a. **Title** (title should not contain more than 20 words, please do not use standard abbreviations)
b. **Strand specification** (please do not forget to mark the strand into which your abstract fits the best)
c. **Preferred presentation modality type** (e. g. paper, panel, round-table)
d. **Up to 5 keywords for each abstract** (3 as a minimum required count)
e. **The abstract text itself should reflect the following points:**

    ▪ Rationale

    ▪ Objectives sought

    ▪ Brief narrative and justification (with regards to the review criteria below)

For papers submission:

a. presenting author's name (eventually co-authors' names and email addresses)
b. presenting author's concise bio (within 100 words)

For panels:

a. a chair of the panel
b. at least 2 panel members (including their affiliation and e-mail addresses)
c. titles of their respective contributions
d. concise bios of all panel members (within 100 words each)
e. specify how the individual panellist will contribute to the panel and for how long
f. participatory elements (if applicable)

For round-tables:

a. a chair of the round-table
b. introductory speaker (including his/her affiliation and e-mail addresses)
c. at least 2 discussants (including their affiliation and e-mail addresses)
d. titles of their respective contributions
e. concise bios of all round-table participants (within 100 words each)
f. specify how will each participant contribute to the panel and for how long
g. participatory elements (if applicable)

For papers and panels - willingness to submit a full paper

Review criteria for abstracts

Abstract authors should keep in mind the below criteria while preparing their submissions:

➢ **Relevance to the evaluation community**: Is the topic likely to evince interest among evaluation practitioners, managers, commissioners and/or users?

➢ **Quality**: Does the proposal meet high professional quality standards?

➢ **Improvement of evaluation capability or skills:** does the abstract focus on material that potentially improves evaluators' capabilities?

➢ **Creativity and innovation**: Is the proposed contribution likely to generate a fruitful debate through the dissemination of new ideas and innovative approaches, potentially going beyond the "business as usual"?

➢ **Public interest:** Is the proposed contribution likely to advance the public interest through the promotion of diversity and equity, cross-cultural exchanges, and diversity of perspectives?

➢ **Gender equality and equity issues:** consideration of gender and equity related aspects and intersectionality.

➢ **Should you have any difficulties** while submitting your abstract or should you need any further information, please contact the Event secretariat – Scientific Programme (eesonline2023@gmail.com)