**Review criteria for colloquia**

**Theoretical underpinning**

Is the work well grounded in previous research? Are the research questions and hypotheses theoretically contextualised? For theory-based colloquia (i.e. those that propose a new framework, or reinterpret earlier studies), is the discussion substantive/thought-provoking/insightful?

A colloquium with a clear theoretical context deserves a 7, provided that hypotheses are also tested (in empirical studies) and connected to other relevant research. An unfocused colloquium that is not theoretically (or methodologically) contextualised deserves a 1. An empirically-orientated colloquium without clear and specific research questions and without reference to previous research also deserves a 1.

**Range and coherence**

Considering all the proposals submitted within the colloquium, is there a good balance between range and coherence?

7 meaning 'very coherent, with each study contributing new insights’, and a 1 meaning ‘unrelated studies, with very limited range'.

**Originality**

How original is the proposed colloquium in terms of its theoretical and/or methodological contributions?

Please rate on the scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is the lowest and 7 the highest level of originality.

**Rigour**

For the colloquium as a whole, do the authors provide sufficient information about the participants, materials, procedures, analyses, or theories and models? Are the claims well supported by the data? Is the design an appropriate way of approaching the specific research issue?

Please rate on the scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is the least and 7 the most rigorous colloquium proposal.

**Significance**

How would you rate the significance of the contribution to the field of second language research?

Choose 7 for a highly significant contribution, 1 for a contribution of low significance.

**Overall impression**

Please give your overall impression, with a 7 meaning ‘definitely accept’, and a 1 meaning ‘definitely reject’.

If you have some serious reservations about individual components of the colloquium, and you believe the colloquium should be accepted but without that/those components, tell us in one of the comments sections bellow.

**Reviewer confidence**

How confident are you in your judgements about this colloquium proposal?

Choose 7 for very confident, 1 for very uncertain.

**Motivation of overall impression**

Please feel free to enter your motivation for your overall impression here (optional), and to supply detailed comments to back up your rankings. Evaluations, including motivation of overall impression and detailed comments, will be forwarded to the authors of the paper. The comments will help the committee decide the outcome of the paper, and will help justify this decision for the authors. Hence, the more detailed you make your comments, the more useful your review will be - both for the committee and for the authors.

**Confidential comments for the committee**

You may wish to withhold some comments from the authors, and include them solely for the committee's internal use. For example, you may wish to write something which would expose your identity to the authors. If you wish to share confidential comments with the organising committee only, this is the place to put them.