Procedures OF IAC SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Selection of the IAC Scientific Committee

The Officer’s Group selects the Chair and the members of the Scientific Committee based on leadership and organizational skills. The scientific committee is composed of outstanding educators, researchers, reflective practitioners and leaders, with demonstrated interests in the field of counselling. The nomination and selection of members of the scientific committee is a major professional and academic responsibility that IAC takes very seriously. Members are selected using the following criteria as a guide:

a.) Current member of IAC

b.) Working knowledge of IAC conferences

c.) Knowledge of counselling theory and practice

d.) Research contributions to the field;

e.) Awareness of global trends in counselling

f.) Awareness of the profession within and across countries

g.) Contributions to major scientific journals and publications in the field

h) Peer reviewer of counselling-related journals

i.) Attendance at relevant professional meetings

j.) Ability to respect deadlines

The Chair of the Committee will:

- Establish a deadline date for submission of proposals, and a date for review decisions to be given typically nine months before the conference to allow time for accepted candidates to obtain funding to attend.
- Review proposal criteria and submit to the CEO for uploading to the conference website.
- Determine marking criteria for double blind review and send to Committee members.
- Ensure proposals meet the criteria required.
- Send abstracts for double blind review by committee with a deadline for completion.
- Refer any general conference queries received to the CEO and/or IAC Secretary.
- Consider marking scores and decide on acceptance, rejection or ask for further work.
- Give written feedback to candidates where additional information is required before acceptance.
- Send a letter of acceptance or rejection to the candidates using the format provided.

The role of the Scientific Committee is to review proposals for pre-conference Workshops, presentations for Working groups and Posters. The process involves a double-blind review, which means that both reviewer and author identities are concealed from each other throughout the review process. This process provides the following information on the conference and/or IAC websites.

Types of Proposals

Individuals may submit proposals in more than one of the following three categories. The proposals submitted undergo a double-blind review, which means that both reviewer and author identities are concealed from each other throughout the review process.

To facilitate this authors’ need to ensure that their manuscripts are prepared in a way that does not give away their identity as follows:

The first page should contain the title, authors' names and affiliations, and a complete address for the corresponding author including telephone and e-mail address. The rest of the proposal is in a Blinded Manuscript with no author details.

Information to help prepare the Blinded Manuscript
Use the third person to refer to work the authors’ previous work
Cite papers published by the author(s) in the text as follows: ‘[Anonymous, 2007]’
For blinding in the reference list: ‘[Anonymous 2007] Details omitted for double-blind reviewing’
Remove any identifying data
Do not include acknowledgments

A. Workshop proposals should include:

1. Title and topic
2. Presenting author and if any, co-authors (for joint papers)
3. Abstract (200-300 words) which should include:
   - The rationale of their Workshop
   - What participants would gain from the Workshop
   - Learning outcomes of the workshop

Three to five major references, if applicable (American Psychological Association – APA – style). For example, include references that support the research undertaken and the methodology used. If the submission is practice focussed, then supply details of the experience and links to pertinent theoretical frameworks. Link to APA format: http://www.apastyle.org/

B. For Working Group proposals should include:

Title and topic
Presenting author and if any, co-authors (for joint papers)
Abstract (200-300 words) which should include:

- The goals, theoretical framework, research questions, rationale
- Methodology (design, procedures, participants, instruments)
- Major findings, limitations, conclusions & discussion
- Three to six key words
- Three to five major references, if applicable (American Psychological Association – APA – style). For example, include references that support the research undertaken and the methodology used. If the submission is practice
focussed, then supply details of the experience and links to pertinent theoretical frameworks. Link to APA format: http://www.apastyle.org/

**Note**: If the presented study is based on a Master’s or Doctoral thesis, this must be indicated.

**C. For Posters proposals should include:**

1. Title and topic
2. Presenting author and if any, co-authors (for joint papers)
3. Abstract (200-300 words) which should include:
   
   - The goals, theoretical framework, research questions, rationale
   - Methodology (design, procedures, participants, instruments)
   - Major findings, limitations, conclusions & discussion
   - Three to six key words.
   - Three to five major references, if applicable (American Psychological Association – APA – style). For example, include references that support the research undertaken and the methodology used. If the submission is practice focussed, then supply details of the experience and links to pertinent theoretical frameworks. Link to APA format: http://www.apastyle.org/

**Note**: If the presented study is based on a Master’s or Doctoral thesis, this has to be indicated.

**The Process of Selection**

The Chair of the Committee will receive proposals and circulate them to Committee members for review using a rubric with space for comments. Reviewers are asked to provide anonymous comments to the author(s) and are also given the option of providing confidential comments to the Committee Chair. The comments to the author(s) are also made available to other reviewers of the manuscript. Considerations might include originality and significance of contribution for practitioners; international relevance; coverage of appropriate existing literature; adequacy of methodology, analysis and interpretation;
clear, concise and jargon-free writing style; organisation. Reviewers are not expected to correct or copy edit manuscripts. Language correction is not part of the peer review process.

**Abstract Selection Criteria**

Abstracts are reviewed based on the following criteria:

- The topic identifies critical issues in the subject area
- The topic is relevant to conference attendees
- The ideas presented are new and innovative
- The abstract is well written and clear.
- The outcomes are clear.
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