
CONFERENCE COLLABORATION PROGRAMME

Conference Proposal and Application Template

The Criterion: An International Journal in English | Galaxy: International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

Important Notice: Submission of this proposal does not constitute an agreement to publish. All papers submitted through any approved collaboration will undergo the full independent peer review process of the relevant journal. Acceptance for publication is determined solely by the editorial board on the basis of scholarly merit. No guarantee of publication should be communicated to conference participants at any stage.

Proposals should be submitted electronically via the RCELL online application portal. Queries may be directed to the Editor-in-Chief of the relevant journal through the contact details listed at rcell.co.in.

Section 1: Journal Selection

Please indicate the journal for which this collaboration is proposed. Organisers may apply to both journals if the conference scope is appropriate to each. Separate editorial evaluations will be conducted for each journal.

Journal (select one or both)

- The Criterion: An International Journal in English**
Scope: English Literature, Literary Theory, Linguistics, ELT, Cultural Studies, Postcolonial Studies, Digital Humanities, Indian Writing in English, World Literature.
 - Galaxy: International Multidisciplinary Research Journal**
Scope: Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, Education, Commerce and Management, Agricultural Sciences, Science, and interdisciplinary research areas. Research papers only.
-

Section 2: Conference Identification

Provide the full and accurate details of the conference for which collaboration is sought. All information supplied in this section will be used in the editorial evaluation of the proposal.

Full Title of Conference	
Conference Acronym / Short Title (if applicable)	
Conference Theme or Sub-Theme	
Edition or Series (e.g., 3rd Annual, Inaugural)	
Proposed Dates of Conference	
Conference Format	<input type="checkbox"/> In-Person <input type="checkbox"/> Online <input type="checkbox"/> Hybrid
Venue / Platform	
City and Country (if in-person or hybrid)	

Section 3: Organising Institution and Governance

Institutional transparency and governance clarity are essential criteria in the editorial evaluation of collaboration proposals. Please provide complete and accurate information.

3.1 Lead Organising Institution

Name of Lead Institution	
Type of Institution	<input type="checkbox"/> University <input type="checkbox"/> College <input type="checkbox"/> Research Centre <input type="checkbox"/> Scholarly Society <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Department <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify below)
If other, please specify	
Country	
Official Website of Institution	

3.2 Co-Organising Institutions (if applicable)

List all co-organising or co-sponsoring institutions. Add rows as required.

Co-organiser 1 — Name and Country	
Co-organiser 2 — Name and Country	

Co-organiser 3 — Name and Country

3.3 Primary Conference Convenor

The Primary Convenor is the individual who will serve as the principal point of contact with the journal editorial office throughout the collaboration process.

Full Name

Academic Title and Designation

Department and Institution

Email Address (institutional preferred)

ORCID (if available)

Academic Profile / Website (URL)

3.4 Additional Organising Committee Members

Provide names, institutional affiliations, and roles for all members of the organising committee. This information assists the editorial board in assessing academic credibility and governance structure.

Organising Committee — Names, Affiliations, and Roles

List each member on a separate line: Full Name | Institution | Role/Position

Section 4: Academic Rationale and Thematic Scope

This section is the intellectual core of the proposal. Organisers are asked to articulate the scholarly basis for the conference and to demonstrate why a special journal issue would meaningfully advance the relevant field of research. Responses should be written in formal academic register and should reflect the rigour expected of published scholarship. Approval of a collaboration proposal does not imply acceptance of any individual manuscript for publication.

4.1 Conference Overview and Scholarly Rationale

Describe the intellectual motivation for the conference. What scholarly questions or debates does it address? What contribution does it make to its field? (300–500 words recommended)

Academic Rationale

Begin writing here...

4.2 Relevance to Journal Scope

Explain specifically how the conference theme aligns with the scope and editorial interests of the journal(s) selected in Section 1. Where relevant, reference the journal's key subject areas. (150–250 words recommended)

Relevance to Journal Scope

Begin writing here...

4.3 Proposed Special Issue Theme

State the proposed title or thematic focus for the special issue that may result from this collaboration. This may differ from the conference title itself and should reflect the scholarly focus of expected submissions.

Proposed Special Issue Theme

Proposed title or thematic framing for the special issue:

Section 5: Conference Review Process and Quality Assurance

The journal's editorial board will consider the quality-assurance mechanisms in place for the conference itself as part of the evaluation of this collaboration proposal. This section must be completed fully and accurately. Misrepresentation of any aspect of the conference review process will result in immediate disqualification.

Conference review processes are evaluated independently of the journal's peer review system and do not replace journal peer review requirements.

5.1 Conference Acceptance Model

Select the model that most accurately describes how presentations are accepted for the conference. If more than one model applies to different categories of presentation, indicate this and provide clarification below.

- Peer-Reviewed (Abstract Review) — Abstracts are evaluated by independent academic reviewers before acceptance.
- Peer-Reviewed (Full Paper Review) — Full manuscripts are evaluated by independent academic reviewers before acceptance.
- Academically Screened — Submissions are reviewed by the organising committee or an editorial panel for academic suitability, without full external peer review.
- Open Participation Academic Event — Participation is open to all registrants meeting stated academic eligibility criteria; submissions are not individually reviewed prior to acceptance.

5.2 Description of Review Process

Provide a detailed description of the process by which presentations are selected for the conference. Include the number of reviewers per submission, review criteria, and any conflict-of-interest management procedures. If using external peer reviewers, indicate how they are selected and credentialled.

Description of Review Process
<i>Begin writing here...</i>

5.3 Scientific or Programme Committee

List the members of the scientific or programme committee (if one exists). Provide names, institutional affiliations, and areas of expertise. This information assists the journal in assessing the academic rigour of the conference review process.

Scientific / Programme Committee
<i>List each member on a separate line: Full Name Institution Area of Expertise</i>

Section 6: Anticipated Participation and Submission Projections

The information requested below assists the editorial board in planning review capacity and issue structure. Estimates should be made with reasonable care; significant discrepancies between projected and actual figures may be noted in subsequent evaluations.

6.1 Conference Participation

Estimated total number of paper / presentation submissions expected	
Estimated total number of accepted presentations at the conference	
Anticipated number of countries represented	
Anticipated academic level of participants	<input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate <input type="checkbox"/> Early Career <input type="checkbox"/> Established Researchers <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed

6.2 Journal Submission Projections

These figures concern potential submissions to the journal following the conference, not conference acceptances. Organisers are reminded that only selected presenters will be invited to submit, and all submissions will undergo full independent peer review.

Estimated number of presenters likely to be invited to submit extended papers to the journal	
Estimated number of extended papers likely to be submitted to the journal for peer review	
Preferred target publication issue or approximate timeline	

6.3 Proposed Guest Editor(s)

Provide details for the individual(s) proposed as Guest Editor(s) for the special issue. Guest editors must hold appropriate academic qualifications and must not have a conflict of interest with anticipated submissions. Final approval of guest editors rests with the Editor-in-Chief of the relevant journal.

Guest Editor 1 — Full Name	
Academic Position and Institution	
Relevant Expertise	
Email Address	
ORCID (if available)	

Guest Editor 2 — Full Name (if applicable)

Academic Position and Institution

Relevant Expertise

Section 7: Prior Collaboration and Publication History

The information provided in this section assists the editorial board in assessing the track record and reliability of the organising body. All responses should be complete and accurate.

7.1 Previous Editions of This Conference

Has this conference been held previously?

Yes No This is the inaugural edition

If yes, number of previous editions

If previous editions have been held, provide a brief account of prior publication outcomes — for example, whether proceedings, journal issues, or edited volumes resulted. Include journal titles and years where relevant.

Prior Publication Outcomes

Begin writing here...

7.2 Existing Relationships with Academic Publishers or Journals

Disclose any existing or concurrent collaboration agreements with other academic journals or publishers in connection with this conference or its associated publications.

Existing Publisher / Journal Relationships

Begin writing here, or write N/A if not applicable:

Section 8: Supporting Documentation

Organisers are required to submit the following documents alongside this completed proposal. Documents should be submitted in PDF format unless otherwise specified. Where documents are in a language other than English, a sufficient English-language summary or translation must be included.

Required Documents

1. Formal call for papers or conference programme (full draft or published version).
2. Academic profiles or curriculum vitae for the Primary Convenor and all proposed Guest Editors.
3. Official letter of authorisation or endorsement from the lead institution or organising body (on institutional letterhead).

Supplementary Documents (where applicable)

4. Evidence of scientific or programme committee membership.
5. Documentation of previous conference editions (proceedings, programmes, or outcome reports).
6. Any additional material the organiser considers relevant to the editorial assessment of the proposal.

Section 9: Ethical Declaration and Compliance

This section constitutes a formal declaration of ethical compliance. Each item must be read carefully and confirmed by placing an appropriate mark in the confirmation column. Submission of this proposal with the declarations confirmed constitutes a binding commitment to the principles stated therein.

No.	Declaration Statement	Confirmed
1.	I confirm that all information provided in this proposal is accurate, complete, and truthful to the best of my knowledge.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	I confirm that this conference is a genuine academic event with a clearly stated scholarly purpose and is not organised primarily for commercial gain.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	I confirm that no guarantee of journal publication has been or will be communicated to conference presenters or participants at any stage, in any medium.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	I understand and accept that all papers submitted to the journal through this collaboration will undergo the journal's full double-blind peer review process under standard editorial criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	I confirm that this proposal complies with the publication ethics standards of the relevant journal and with the guidelines of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.	I confirm that no article processing charges (APCs) or publication fees will be imposed on authors by the organising body as a condition of submission or publication.	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	I confirm that I am authorised to submit this proposal on behalf of the lead organising institution and that the relevant institutional body is aware of and supports this collaboration application.	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	I confirm that any conflicts of interest between organising committee members, proposed guest editors, and likely submitting authors will be disclosed to the journal at the earliest opportunity.	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	I confirm that the conference does not currently hold and will not seek concurrent publication commitments with other journals for the same	<input type="checkbox"/>

	papers proposed for submission to this journal, unless prior written agreement has been obtained from the Editor-in-Chief.	
10.	I agree that, if this collaboration is approved, all communication with conference Participants regarding the journal collaboration will be reviewed and approved by the journal's editorial office prior to dissemination.	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	I confirm that conference registration fees are independent of journal publication decisions and do not include publication fees.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section 10: Authorisation and Submission

This proposal must be authorised by the Primary Convenor. Where institutional endorsement is required or available, a co-signatory from the relevant institution may be added. Submission of this completed form constitutes acceptance of all terms stated in the RCELL Conference Collaboration Programme guidelines.

- Journal logos cannot be used before approval.
- Collaboration announcement text must be approved by the journal editors.
- Conferences cannot advertise publication guarantees.

Full Name of Primary Convenor	
Academic Position and Institution	
Signature	
Date of Submission (DD/MM/YYYY)	
Full Name of Institutional Co-signatory (if applicable)	
Position and Institution of Co-signatory	
Signature of Co-signatory	
Date	

Please retain a copy of this completed proposal for your records. Acknowledgement of receipt will be issued by the editorial office within ten working days of submission. Proposals will be evaluated by the editorial board and a decision communicated within sixty days of receipt. RCELL reserves the right to request additional information at any stage of the evaluation process.

