SIRC 2024 CONFERENCE CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS, REVIEW PROCESS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

2024 Society for Implementation Research Collaboration Conference

Important Dates:
SIRC 2024 Pre-Conference Workshops: September 26th, 2024
SIRC 2024 Conference Presentations: September 27th & 28th, 2024

Call for Submissions
Deadline: April 30, 2024

Strategic Synergy: Implementation Research, Practice, and Policy for Impact

Conference Theme Overview

The goal of the 2024 Society for Implementation Research Collaboration (SIRC) Conference is to facilitate collaboration, inspiration, and shared learning about cutting-edge advancements in implementation practice, policy, and research. This is the 7th biennial SIRC conference and it comes at an important point in time to consider how advancements in policy, research, and practice can accelerate implementation of evidence-based practices into real-world contexts to achieve impactful change both domestically and internationally. Our conference theme this year is *Strategic Synergy: Implementation Research, Practice and Policy for Impact*. Our goal is to look for synergies between these three key domains of implementation to maximize equitable, generalizable, and global impact. The conference will begin with topic-specific Pre-Conference Workshops and our invited Implementation Development Workshops (IDWs; information will be forthcoming) followed by two days of different presentation formats as described below.

Submissions Welcomed

Submissions are welcome from multiple disciplines and settings, including (but not limited to): behavioral and mental health, medicine, public health, child welfare, juvenile and criminal justice, education, prevention, early intervention, and developmental disabilities. Implementation Science is a dynamic field that includes research, practice, and policy, with many ongoing

developments and expansive applications to different contexts, disease areas, public health issues, and human service sectors locally and globally.

As result, we welcome all types of submissions across the field of implementation practice, policy, and research, including those with service user engagement.

This year, we will prioritize submissions that represent the full continuum of implementation, including integrating practice, policy, and research, with particular emphasis on submissions that advance the field and highlight innovative approaches.

Submissions will advance knowledge about:
- Implementation approaches and strategies
- Implementation research design and methods
- Pragmatic approaches to process and outcome measurement, theories, and frameworks
- Strategies to evaluate implementation impact on organizational practices, client outcomes, and system-level outcomes
- Policy activities and practice approaches that move this work forward.

Submissions will also educate attendees about essential components, including
- Partnerships between community settings and researchers, as well as between researchers and practitioners
- Generalizable principles and strategies for capacity building
- Infrastructure development to promote scalability
- Policy opportunities to invest in and sustain evidence-based practices over time
- Implementation practice strategies that integrate and maintain evidence-based practices in service delivery contexts.

Session Formats
We invite submissions for 20-minute oral presentations, 75-minute symposia, 5-minute "Slam" presentations, and posters. We are particularly interested in presentations that describe how to facilitate collaboration, inspiration, and shared learning about cutting-edge advancements in implementation research, policy, and practice applications. Submissions not accepted for an oral delivery format will be considered for the poster or "Slam" format unless declined by author.

Additional details on presentation formats are as follows:

> **Oral presentations** – Accepted 20-minute oral presentations will be organized by the conference planning committee to ideally align themes within a section of several oral presentations. Each section will include a conference-invited moderator to facilitate questions, discussion, and add informal summative remarks at the conclusion of the section. After acceptance, oral presentation presenters will be notified of other presentations (and presenters) in their section and their moderator.

> **Symposia** – To submit a 75-minute symposium, a symposium chair and discussant (can be the same person) must be identified, along with 3 to 4 oral presentations. The symposium presentations must have a common theme, upon which the discussant will

summarize and comment. A symposium presentation may be 3-4 thematically connected but distinct projects or one or two projects that include multiple perspectives (e.g., a provider, intermediary, administrator, and researcher talking about the project from their respective positions). The chair and/or discussant can also be a presenter on one of the presentations. For *Symposium* submissions, authors will make one submission that includes the symposia overview summary, followed by each oral presentation (individual titles and summary). Please note there are limited symposium slots available.

Posters – Poster presentations are intended to communicate via figures or other visual content and some text. Poster presentations facilitate one-on-one interactions and networking among SIRC attendees interested in similar topics. One presenter must be available at the poster to provide information and answer questions throughout the entire poster session.

"Slams" * NEW FORMAT ***:** Slams are short, 5-minute talks designed to engage and entertain while disseminating information in an easy-to-follow format in order to reach a wide audience. Slams typically avoid scientific jargon and use well-chosen pictures and metaphors to explain complex topics. Example of a Slam presentation: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GyWpOGvUsCU

The *Ex Ordo* submission portal requires that submissions specify the following information**:**
1. Format (Oral presentation, Symposium, Poster, Slam)
2. Title
3. Description of Submission (300 words or less) with four sections (see Description of Research-Oriented Submissions and Description of Practice/Policy-Oriented Submissions)
4. Does this submission include a student presenter? (Choose one from below)**
   a. Yes
   b. No
5. All presenters' names and affiliations, as well as names and affiliations of collaborators you would like to credit
6. Please indicate the general submission topic. This year, there are different submission instructions and review criteria depending on if submissions are more oriented towards **RESEARCH** or towards **PRACTICE or POLICY**. We recognize many submissions will have both research and practice/policy-oriented components – the choice is about review. Please choose the option with the evaluation criteria you think is the best fit for your submission (See evaluation criteria for Research-Oriented Submissions and Practice/Policy-Oriented Submission)
   a. Research-Oriented submission
   b. Practice/Policy-Oriented submission
7. For Symposium submissions, indicate name and affiliation of discussant and/or chair
8. Acknowledgements (optional)
9. Three to five (3-5) key words that describe your submission, separated by commas
10. If your work is focused on Health Equity, Social Justice, Social Determinants of Health, and/or Engagement with Underserved Communities, please describe in more detail – otherwise indicate "N/A"
11. Project implementation phase (choose one from below):

    a. Planned
    b. In process
    c. Completed
    d. Planning for next phase
    e. Not applicable

12. Does the submission reflect work conducted outside of the United States**
    a. Yes
    b. No

13. Does this submission reflect collaboration/partnerships between at least two different categories: researchers, practitioners, policy-makers, and/or communities being served?**
    a. Yes
    b. No

14. Accepted submissions may be submitted for publication in *Implementation Research and Practice,* along with SIRC 2024 Conference proceedings. Published abstracts offer a mechanism to formalize your presentations and can be referenced as documentation of your work. If accepted, would you want your submission published?
    a. Yes
    b. No

15. For submissions involving Oral Presentations: If your submission is not accepted as an Oral Presentation, would you want your submission to be considered for a Poster or Slam format
    a. Yes
    b. No

16. If selected, would you like to be considered for a scholarship to be able to attend the conference (optional)
    a. Yes
    b. No

** In addition to formal evaluation criteria for quality of submissions, these factors will be considered for equitable representation by students, work conducted outside the United States, and collaborations between implementation stakeholders.

Please click *HERE* view a 9 minute video tutorial offering guidance on the submission process.

Description of Research-Oriented Submissions

    Background: Succinctly outline the rationale for the research study, including the research question/s that were addressed. This is typically accomplished by briefly characterizing the state of the science for the particular area (what we know and do not know), and how this submission advances science (adds something new).

    Methods: Information on the general design, strategy, or approach to the work should be included and be appropriate for the type of submission indicated. The sample, research design, method (e.g., qualitative, quantitative) and analytic plan should be described. A broad range of methodologies are encouraged; preference will not be given to specific research designs, analysis, etc.

Results: Clearly state findings, lessons learned, or results of analyses and provide relevant statistics, if statistics were calculated (e.g., beta coefficients, p-values, correlation coefficients).

Conclusions: Address the significance of the project and implications for future research. At least one principle or strategy should be included that would be useful to implementation practitioners or policy-makers and/or how specific findings might inform implementation projects in the community.

Description of Practice/Policy Oriented Submissions

Background: Succinctly outline the goal of the practice or policy project or the broader practice or policy issues being discussed (e.g., what problems or needs were/are being addressed?). Relevant context should be provided to allow reviewers to determine the impact that the information has for the implementation field, and determine whether/how the case study or other practice/policy project has generalizable take-home messages.

Approach: If the presentation is about a specific implementation project, provide a succinct description of the setting, participants, approach or strategy, and desired outcomes of the project. If the presentation focuses on more conceptual information about implementation practice or policy, a practice-based example or case study should be included.

Outcomes: Identify the lessons learned or conclusions. This can include the results of the specific project but should also include information on the larger impact or implications for implementation from practitioner, policy maker and/or researcher perspectives.

Next Steps: Describe how the outcomes may lead to next steps or what questions remain unanswered that future research or implementation practice needs to tackle.

Other Guidelines
- A presenter can submit a maximum of two (2) first-author abstracts for review.
- For submissions that involve specific research, evaluation, and/or implementation practice projects, submissions should include how the work is grounded in evidence, a foundational model, theory, or method, or describe innovative approaches that are transferable to other contexts. Submissions should reflect work that is generalizable, relevant, or applicable to others. Therefore, implementation practice or locally-specific implementation research should describe general principles, strategies, or conclusions and explicitly how they inform work in other contexts.

Review Process
Please note that the review process will be blinded for authors names (i.e., reviewers will not see authors' names). Reviewers will rate submissions based on Research-Oriented or Practice/Policy-Oriented evaluation criteria. A minimum of 2 reviewers will evaluate each submission.

If you have questions about the submission process or about the conference in general, please email us at sirc2024conference@gmail.com or assistance.

Instructions for Submitting Proposals

** Please Note: Each unique submission must be submitted separately**

If you are unable to move forward to the next step, please refresh the webpage.

Click _HERE_ for Video Tutorial on Submitting Proposals

- Create a new account or log into existing account in SIRC 2024 Conference Submission Website

- Click on the orange "Submit Your Abstract" button. This will open up the submission workflow.

- **Step 1:** Identify Submission format (Oral Presentation, Poster, Symposium, or Slam). See Session Formats for more information. Click "Done" to move to the next step.

- **Step 2:** Enter Title and Description of Submission in "Abstract" text box (300 words or less). For *Symposium* submissions authors will use the "Abstract" text box to submit the symposia overview summary (300 words or less), followed by each oral presentation (individual titles and abstracts- 300 words or less for each abstract). Click "Done" to move to the next step.

- **Step 3:** Identify if this is a student submission (Yes/No). Enter author and co-author information. For *Symposium* submissions, all individual authors will be listed as authors/co-authors. Click "Done" to move to the next step.

- **Step 4:** Provide a short (100 words or less) biography for presenting author(s).

- **Step 5:** Choose **ONE** topic to identify type of submission: **Research-oriented** or **Practice or Policy Oriented**. Click "Done" to move to the next step.

- **Step 6: Additional Questions**. For *Symposium* submissions, indicate the name and affiliation of the Discussant and/or Chair. For all submissions, indicate:
    - Acknowledgments (optional)
    - 3-5 key words (required)
    - Additional details if work is focused on Health Equity, Social Justice, Social Determinants of Health, and/or Engagement with Underserved Communities (required)
    - Project Implementation Phase (If applicable; required),
    - Whether the project was conducted outside of the U.S. (required)
    - Whether the project reflects collaboration/partnerships between at least two different categories: researchers, practitioners, policy-makers, and/or communities being served (required)
    - If accepted, would you want your abstract published in *Implementation Research and Practice* (required)
    - When completed, Click "Done" to move to the next step.

- **Step 7: Considerations.** Answer the following:
    - For submissions involving Oral presentations, would you want your submission to be considered for poster or slam format (if applicable, required)
    - If your submission is accepted, would you like to be considered for a scholarship to be able to attend the conference (Yes/No; Optional)

- o Submission Agreement: Click on the check box indicating your understanding that the submission will be officially sent to SIRC (required)

- o When completed, Click "Done" to complete your submission.

Authors may make edits to their submitted proposals until April 30, 2024.

To edit your abstract:
- Click on "Submissions" on the top of your screen
- Select your submitted abstract
- Scroll down to the "edit" button on the bottom right corner of the abstract and click icon

Submission reviews are expected to start by May 6th, 2024 and end by May 24th, 2024

Click *HERE* for a video tutorial on reviewing for the SIRC 2024 Conference

Submission Topic
This year, submissions are categorized as **RESEARCH-ORIENTED** or **PRACTICE/POLICY-ORIENTED**. Please make sure to confirm which submission topic has been applied to the submission you are reviewing and apply the relevant RESEARCH-ORIENTED or PRACTICE/POLICY-ORIENTED evaluation criteria. You can find your assigned submissions for review in Ex Ordo by click on the top "Reviews" tab.

Criteria Drift and Rating Variability
To reduce the likelihood of criteria drift and rating variability as you move through the abstracts, we ask that you *please read all of your assigned abstracts before evaluating them against each other.*

Conflict of Interest
All reviews will be **blinded**, meaning that presenters' names will not be included for reviewers. Please **quickly scan your assigned abstracts** as early as possible to identify if you may have potential conflicts with one or more of the submissions. If you don't feel that you can provide an unbiased review (for example, if you are involved in the project or are a close collaborator of the presenters), please decline the abstract assignment directly in Ex Ordo, with the option to include a reason if you wish. If you have other inquiries about conflicts of interest, please contact the SIRC 2024 Conference Chair, Dr. Geetha Gopalan (ggopalan@hunter.cuny.edu).

Research-Oriented Submission Evaluation Criteria
Please rate each submission on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating the lowest score and 5 indicating the highest score (with the exception of Acceptance category).

1) **Importance to the Field**
How likely are we to learn something important or cutting edge about implementation that facilitates collaboration, inspiration, and shared learning (e.g., paradigm shift, new strategy or approach; important setting or population; of national or international relevance) about advancements in implementation research, policy, and/or "real-world" practice application from this submission?
   o **1: Poor:** Submission does not belong at this conference
   o **2: Marginal:** Submission will be of low interest or provide little insight for our audience
   o **3: Acceptable:** Submission will be somewhat insightful/instructive and have some interest to our audience.
   o **4: Good:** Submission will be insightful/instructive and will be welcomed by our audience.
   o **5: Excellent:** Submission will generate deep insights and be enthusiastically welcomed by our audience.

2) **Strength of Approach**

How strong are methods or approaches taken to generate insights about implementation research, practice, or policy? Does it build in a meaningful way on previous implementation practice or research and, if similar to other projects or frameworks, does it articulate how and why such replication is meaningful? Are implementation theories, models, frameworks, strategies, or other approaches that were chosen clear? Strength of approach includes generalizability to other practices or contexts, rigor based on prior science, practice or theory, and/or stakeholder input on design or co-creation based on participatory methods.

- o **1: Poor:** Submission has serious errors in method/approach, is poorly described, or contains serious ethical concerns.
- o **2: Marginal:** Submission methodology or approach is unclear or inappropriate.
- o **3: Acceptable:** Submission methodology or approach is clear or appropriate.
- o **4: Good:** Submission methodology or approach is well described, strong, and/or promotes generalizability.
- o **5: Excellent:** Submission methodology or approach is exceptional and promotes generalizability.

3) Innovation

To what extent does the submission reflect a new or innovative topic, methodology or analysis approach, implications, practice, and/or context? "Innovation" is defined by featuring something new, creative, original, challenging the status quo, thinking outside the box, or taking calculated risks to drive progress and achieve breakthroughs.

- o **1: Not at all innovative:** This particular work has already been sufficiently addressed.
- o **2: Low innovation:** This work presents a small incremental improvement over existing work.
- o **3: Minor Improvement:** The same topic/problem/issue has been examined or addressed before, but this presentation presents a new approach or data that has not yet been presented.
- o **4: Major Improvement:** This work represents a significant expansion of prior work
- o **5: New/Novel:** This is a new topic in this area, a dramatically different methodology, tool, or approach and/or presents data dramatically challenging current assumptions.

4) Organization and Clarity

How well-organized and clear is the submission in terms of the rationale or background, goal or focus, methods or approach, results or findings, and conclusions, limitations, or implications for future work?

- o **1: Poor:** Submission cannot be evaluated due to poor writing and organization.
- o **2: Marginal:** Submission can be understood with some difficulty due to writing quality or lack of explanation.
- o **3: Acceptable:** Submission is mostly understandable; follows required section.
- o **4: Good:** Submission is clear and organized; follows required sections.
- o **5: Excellent:** Submission is very well written and organized; follows required sections.

5) Acceptance

Should this submission be accepted at this conference in your opinion? Please specify your judgement in "Comments" section

- o **1:** Do not accept

- o **2:** Accept as a slam (if not submitted in slam format)
- o **3:** Accept as a poster (if not submitted in poster format)
- o **4:** Borderline accept/reject in current format
- o **5:** Probably accept in current format
- o **6:** Definitely accept in current format

6) Comments

Please add any additional comments regarding the submission, especially any ratings of "3" or lower in the Importance to the Field, Strength of Approach, Innovation, or Organization and Clarity scoring categories, or "5" or below in the Acceptance category. Please provide comments if you weren't sure if the proposal met a certain standard, etc. Please also note and explain if you feel that the rating for the proposal does not accurately reflect the proposal's overall merit.

Practice/Policy Oriented Submission Evaluation Criteria

Please rate each submission on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating the lowest score and 5 indicating the highest score (with the exception of Acceptance category).

1) Importance to the Field

How likely are we to learn something important or cutting edge about implementation practice or policy from this presentation that facilitates collaboration, inspiration, and shared learning (e.g., paradigm shift, new strategy or approach; important setting or population; of national or international relevance)? Does the presentation have the potential to push forward future practice or policy in generalizable ways? Are specific queries provided for future implementation research?
- o **1: Poor:** Submission does not belong at this conference
- o **2: Marginal:** Submission will be of low interest or provide little insight for our audience
- o **3: Acceptable:** Submission will be somewhat insightful/instructive and have some interest to our audience.
- o **4: Good:** Submission will be insightful/instructive and will be welcomed by our audience.
- o **5: Excellent:** Submission will generate deep insights and be enthusiastically welcomed by our audience.

2) Strength of Approach

How thoughtful and coherent is the approach described in the proposed presentation? Does it build in a meaningful way on previous implementation practice or research and, if similar to other projects or frameworks, does it articulate how and why such replication is meaningful? Are implementation theories, models, frameworks, strategies, or other approaches that were chosen clear? Strength of approach includes rigor based on prior science, practice or theory, and/or meaningful utilization of stakeholder input or co-creation based on participatory methods.
- o **1: Poor:** Submission has serious errors in method/approach, is poorly described, or contains serious ethical concerns.
- o **2: Marginal:** Submission methodology or approach is unclear or inappropriate.
- o **3: Acceptable:** Submission methodology or approach is clear or appropriate.

- o **4: Good:** Submission methodology or approach is well described, strong, and/or promotes generalizability.
- o **5: Excellent:** Submission methodology or approach is exceptional and promotes generalizability.

3) Innovation
How innovative is the content of the presentation? "Innovation" is defined by featuring something new, creative, original, challenging the status quo, thinking outside the box, or taking calculated risks to drive progress and achieve breakthroughs. The presentation could have content that is innovative due to a variety of things, such as topic, approach, elegant solutions, funding source, population served, scale of the project, challenges addressed.
- o **1: Not at all innovative:** This particular work has already been sufficiently addressed.
- o **2: Low innovation:** This work presents a small incremental improvement over existing work.
- o **3: Minor Improvement:** The same topic/problem/issue has been examined or addressed before, but this presentation presents a new approach or data that has not yet been presented.
- o **4: Major Improvement:** This work represents a significant expansion of prior work
- o **5: New/Novel:** This is a new topic in this area, a dramatically different methodology, tool, or approach and/or presents data dramatically challenging current assumptions.

4) Organization and Clarity
How well-organized and clear is the submission in terms of the rationale or background, goal or focus, approach, and conclusions? Key limitations are articulated as well as the implications for future work.
- o **1: Poor:** Submission cannot be evaluated due to poor writing and organization.
- o **2: Marginal:** Submission can be understood with some difficulty due to writing quality or lack of explanation.
- o **3: Acceptable:** Submission is mostly understandable; follows required sections.
- o **4: Good:** Submission is clear and organized; follows required sections.
- o **5: Excellent:** Submission is very well written and organized; follows required sections.

5) Acceptance
Should this submission be accepted at this conference in your opinion? Please specify your judgement in "Comments" section
- o **1:** Do not accept
- o **2:** Accept as a slam (if not submitted in slam format)
- o **3:** Accept as a poster (if not submitted in poster format)
- o **4:** Borderline accept/reject in current format
- o **5:** Probably accept in current format
- o **6:** Definitely accept in current format

6) Comments
Please add any additional comments regarding the submission, especially any ratings of "3" or lower in the Importance to the Field, Strength of Approach, Innovation, or Organization and Clarity scoring categories, or "5" or below in the Acceptance category. Please provide

comments if you weren't sure if the proposal met a certain standard, etc. Please also note and explain if you feel that the rating for the proposal does not accurately reflect the proposal's overall merit.