

American Academy of Forensic Sciences – Anthropology Section Annual Meeting Abstract Review Process

1. Review Committee

- a. The Review Committee will consist of the Anthropology Program Committee Chair and co-Chair, and at least five other advisory reviewers from the Anthropology Section.
- b. The advisory reviewers will be selected by the Anthropology Program Committee Chair and co-Chair, with the Program Chair having final authority over the selection process. Advisory reviewers should represent a broad-based academic/research and/or practitioner perspective. Advisory reviewers should also be Members or Fellows of the Anthropology Section.
- c. The Review Committee will sign the Program Committee Disclosure Form and return the form to the American Academy of Forensic Sciences.

2. Initial Review

- a. The submitted abstracts will be evenly divided amongst the Review Committee by the Chair and co-Chair with emphasis placed on awareness of potential conflicts of interest.
- b. The following guidelines will be followed when distributing abstracts:
 - i. A reviewer cannot review his/her own paper.
 - ii. A reviewer cannot review his/her student's paper.
 - iii. A reviewer cannot review a paper from his/her agency, organization, or academic institution.
 - iv. Reviewers cannot review papers that they have had previous involvement as either a grant reviewer or consultant on the project, or other similar capacity.
- c. Each member of the Review Committee will make a recommendation to accept or reject an abstract based on the following criteria:
 - i. Did the applicant follow the AAFS submission criteria?
 - ii. Is the abstract/subject relevant to the discipline?
 1. If not, identify the most appropriate section, and the Program Chair will discuss transfer to a different section with the applicant.
 - iii. Is there a clearly demonstrated command of all previous relevant work?
 1. If relevant references are included, an abstract should contain a Cited References section.
 - iv. Is the study design clearly articulated?
 - v. Is the study design valid?
 - vi. Are results presented?
 1. Are they valid?
 2. Do they support the conclusions?
 - vii. Quality of writing (i.e. typographical errors, proper grammar).
 - viii. Is the abstract/subject relevant to the program/meeting theme?
 - ix. Has the lead author submitted more than one paper to the section?
 1. The intent is to develop a diverse program with no individual dominating the agenda. Multiple high-quality papers from a single author should be accepted, particularly if they highlight different avenues of research; however, authors with multiple submissions may be requested to distill and combine presentations to minimize repetition.
 - x. Is the abstract written with the appropriate audience in mind (e.g. over simplistic or general statements should be avoided)?

- d. A rubric will be used to score the submissions. It allows a quantification of the previously listed consideration. The scoring rubric is on the next page and allows the Anthropology Committee Program Chair and co-Chair to fill available podium and poster slots utilizing a scoring system.
 - i. Scoring Scale for the Abstract:
0-3 = no; 4-5 = maybe; 6-7 = yes

3. Accept/Reject

- a. The Anthropology Committee Program Chair and co-Chair will determine whether to accept or reject an abstract based on an independent review of the abstracts by the Program Chair and co-Chair, and the recommendations made by the advisory reviewers on the Review Committee. One of the following decisions will result:
 - i. Accept without modification
 - ii. Accept with revision
 - iii. Change from podium to poster or poster to podium
 - iv. Recommend submission to a different Section.
 - v. Reject

4. Communication of Decision to Review Committee

- a. The Program Chair will communicate the decisions to the Review Committee and will organize a meeting/web-conference to:
 - i. Collectively review the abstracts and discuss issues associated with specific papers.
 - ii. Discuss actions taken by the Program Chair that are contrary to a recommendation made by an advisory reviewer.
 - iii. Develop the program schedule and identify potential moderators.

5. Schedule

- a. The schedule outline will be communicated to the AAFS by the Program Chair within the time-frame required by the AAFS.

6. Communication of Decision to Authors

- a. The Program Chair will communicate with authors that have submitted abstracts that are:
 - i. Accepted, but require revision
 - ii. Changed from podium to poster or poster to podium.
 - iii. Proposed for a section switch.
 - iv. Combine presentations if lead author has submitted multiple papers to section.
- b. The AAFS will communicate with authors that have submitted abstracts that are:
 - i. Accepted without modification.
 - ii. Rejected.
- c. Speakers are required to register and pay a basic registration fee after notifications are received.

7. Dissenting Opinion

- a. There is no formal appeals process, given the limited time available to finalize the program. However, the Program Chair and submitting authors are encouraged to discuss the decision-making process and determine if there is an alternative to rejection of the submitted abstract.
- b. Authors may submit a dissenting opinion that will be retained by the Section's Program Chair/Executive Committee for a period of one year.

SCORING RUBRIC FOR ANTHROPOLOGY ABSTRACTS

Thank you for agreeing to review the Anthropology abstracts. Please use this rubric when evaluating each abstract. When you have completed your review, put the score in the comments box with a “YES,” “NO,” or “MAYBE,” and an explanation why. **DO NOT** check the “no” box on the abstract page.

Do you have a conflict of interest with the author(s) and/or their institution(s) for this abstract?

YES

NO

- 1) Learning objective: Does the abstract provide a novel or important contribution to the field in practice, research, theory, or knowledge?
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)

- 2) Introduction: Do(es) the author(s) provide(s) relevant justification for the study/presentation?
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)

- 3) Methods: a) Are the methods/discussion points clear regardless of research paper, case study, technical note, or theoretical paper?
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)

b) Are the methods/theoretical foundations properly implemented/described, e.g. adequate sample size (if relevant—with actual sample size reported), appropriate analytical methods, comprehensive description.
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)

- 4) Results: a) Are results (quantitative or qualitative) presented?
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)

b) Are the results (quantitative or qualitative) complete (e.g. the results address all the learning objectives, stated hypotheses, or quantitative/qualitative research questions)?
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)

- 5) AAFS Requirements: Does the abstract meet the AAFS requirements for abstracts (length, major editing, etc.)? AAFS abstract length is a "minimum" of 300 words and a "maximum" is 600. If it is over or under that, note it in your comments. References do not count in the word count, but learning objectives and impact statement do. If the abstract does not meet the length requirements, if more than 10 corrections are needed to make the abstract intelligible in English, or if it so poorly worded that you don't know what they are talking about, 0 points should be awarded for this criterion. Please note this in the comment field as well. Style does not count for edits, nor do "happy to glad" corrections. The AAFS staff will do some corrections, but the Program Chair and Co-Chair are responsible for the rest.
(no = 0 pts, yes = 1 pt)

SYMPOSIUM PROPOSAL SUBMISSION – ANTHROPOLOGY SECTION

SUBMISSION PROCESS:

Proposals for symposia should be submitted directly to the Program Chair via e-mail no later than **1 June**. As there is currently no mechanism at the AAFS to have poster symposia, symposium proposals serve as a curation of podium presentations overseen by moderators and potentially with a discussion at the end. The symposium proposal should contain the following information:

1. Title of the symposium
2. Organizer/submitter's e-mail address and affiliation, and the names and affiliations of any co-organizers
3. Full names of two session moderators, e-mail address and affiliation
4. A short abstract (250 word maximum) describing the content and purpose of the symposium. This paragraph will not be published in the AAFS proceedings, but it is helpful to reviewers to understand the goals and vision of the symposium.
5. Full names (spell out first names) and affiliations of the symposium participants, and the titles of their presentations. Number each presentation and list all titles and authors in the order of appearance.
6. A statement of 200 words or less, briefly describing the diversity of session presenters, such as how they offer a balanced representation of the topic, institutional affiliation, career stage, ethnicity, and gender.

Use the following format for symposium participants:

Presentation 1: Title. Author1 last name, full first name, (Affiliation); Author2 as for Author1; etc.
Presentations 2 – n: as for Presentation 1
Discussant: last name, first name spelled out (Affiliation)

For example:

Presentation 1: A history of biological distance analysis. Hefner, Joseph T. (Michigan State University) and Pilloud, Marin A (University of Nevada, Reno)
Presentation 2: Biological distances and population genetics theory. Relethford, John (State University of New York College Oneonta)
Presentation 3: The effects of imputing missing data on biodistance analyses. Kenyhercz, Michael (University of Alaska, Fairbanks) and Passalacqua, Nicholas V. (Central Identification Laboratory)
Presentations 4-9: as above
Discussant: Buikstra, Jane E. (Arizona State University)

Do not submit abstracts, registration materials, or fees at the time the symposium proposal is submitted. Symposia and abstracts (as part of symposia) are subject to review. ***Symposium organizers need to make clear to participants that their abstract can still be rejected at the abstract review stage.***

Each year, the program committee will accept a **MAXIMUM** of **four (4) symposium** proposals as part of the scientific session. All symposia can have a **MAXIMUM** of **eight (8) presentations**. If organizers wish to have a discussant, the discussant will use one of the presentation time slots. All discussants are limited to 15 minutes.

REVIEW PROCESS

The program committee (chair and co-chair) as well as one anonymous peer reviewer will review and rank submitted symposia. The following criteria will be considered:

1. Organization of symposium
2. Cohesiveness of the topic and suggested authors/presentations
3. Diversity of presenters

The symposium organizer will be notified of the committee's decision by **1 July**.

ACCEPTED SYMPOSIA

If the proposal is accepted, symposium abstracts are due **1 August** along with other abstracts.

On **2 August**, the symposium organizer needs to send the program chair an updated list of submitted presentations with any revisions to titles and/or authors indicated. This list also needs to include the name of the SUBMITTING author of the abstract. In this way, the program chair can ensure that these abstracts are properly located, reviewed, and assigned to the appropriate session during planning.

Remember, *acceptance of the symposium does not guarantee acceptance of the individual abstracts; these abstracts are subject to the same review and submission deadlines as are all other abstracts*. We therefore encourage symposium organizers to stay in close contact with contributors and to review abstracts prior to submission. This communication will ensure that abstracts fit the symposium and that they are not rejected. It is the organizer's responsibility to ensure that all abstracts are submitted by the deadline of 1 August, as this is a hard deadline and late abstracts will not be considered.

Further, please note that *speakers in any accepted symposia are required to register and pay a basic registration fee* after notifications are received. Symposium organizers should make any invited speakers aware of this registration requirement when soliciting speakers for the AAFS scientific sessions.