

NCA CONVENTION REVIEW CRITERIA

2026 Annual Convention

Overview

All submissions to the NCA Annual Convention are evaluated using standardized criteria to ensure fair and consistent review across all units. This rubric guides reviewers in assessing individual papers, paper sessions, panel discussions, and performances.

Review Scale

All criteria are rated on a scale of 1-10:

- 1-3 = Low/Weak
- 4-6 = Moderate/Acceptable
- 7-8 = Strong/Good
- 9-10 = Excellent/Outstanding

Evaluation Criteria for All Submissions

Reviewers evaluate each submission using the following criteria:

1. Connection to Convention Theme (1-10)

To what extent does this submission clearly connect to the convention theme?

2. Relevance to Unit (1-10)

To what extent does the submission focus on a current issue or topic relevant to the respective NCA Division or Interest Group?

3. Theoretical Rigor (1-10)

What is the level of theoretical rigor demonstrated in the submission?

4. Methodological Rigor (1-10)

What is the level of methodological rigor demonstrated in the submission?

5. Analytical Rigor (1-10)

What is the level of analytical rigor demonstrated in the submission?

6. Writing Quality (1-10)

What is the level of writing quality, clarity, and organization?

7. Innovation (1-10)

To what extent does this submission introduce new and innovative ideas?

8. Contribution to the Field (1-10)

To what extent does this submission extend understanding of communication?

Additional Criteria for Panel Submissions

For panel discussions and paper sessions, reviewers also evaluate:

9. Distinctiveness Within Theme (1-10)

To what extent does each proposed paper/topic/author have a different focus that separates it from the others, while also fitting the panel's theme?

10. Institutional Diversity (1-10)

To what extent do the panel's participants represent institutional diversity?

Diversity for this criterion includes: representation of multiple institutions, multiple levels of education (e.g., permanent faculty, contingent faculty, graduate students, non-academic practitioners), multiple theoretical perspectives, or multiple methodological approaches.

11. Presenter Qualifications (1-10)

What is the level of expertise and qualifications among proposed presenters for contributing to the proposed panel?

Overall Assessment

After evaluating all applicable criteria, reviewers provide an overall recommendation:

- Strongly Recommend Accepting
- Recommend Accepting
- Undecided
- Recommend Rejecting
- Strongly Recommend Rejecting

Additional Considerations

Reviewers may also indicate:

- Whether the submission should be considered for a top competitive paper award
- Whether the submission should be considered for a top student competitive paper award

- Whether the submission would be appropriate for co-sponsorship with another division or interest group

Reviewer Comments

Comments to Program Planners

Reviewers provide a rationale for their overall recommendation. These comments are only seen by program planners and help inform programming decisions.

Feedback to Submitters

Reviewers provide constructive feedback to submitters that is anonymous unless the reviewer chooses to identify themselves. Effective feedback should:

- Acknowledge what the author(s) did well
- Offer concrete suggestions for improvement
- Provide specific advice on how to strengthen the work for future presentation or publication

Important Information

Review Deadline: April 29, 2026 at 11:59 p.m. Pacific Time

Resources:

- Reviewer FAQs: www.natcom.org/faqs
- Convention Resources: www.natcom.org/convention-resources
- How to Conduct Reviews Using X-CD: support.x-cd.com

Questions?

Contact your unit program planner or email convention@natcom.org