

Presentations

Presentations allow presenters to share applied, data-based work related to clinical practice, performance management, supervision, training, or other applications of behavior analysis. A Presentation may take either of two forms: (a) an applied demonstration of clinical, supervisory, training, or performance management activity that addresses a unique question or creative application of ABA-based strategies with clients, caregivers, or staff; or (b) a technical description of a system, practice, process, or procedure that addresses a practice-related issue or barrier in a meaningful or creative way. Both forms must address a meaningful practice question, challenge, or innovative application and clearly identify the primary takeaways for the audience, including how the information can be applied in practice. The work need not be formal research. Data demonstrating the application and outcomes of the approach are encouraged and strengthen a submission, but are not required.

Requirements: maximum of 2 presenters; a statement confirming appropriate consent was obtained to share any client, caregiver, or staff data and information. Data are encouraged but not required.

Score	Presentations
5	• Abstract clearly describes how attendees will use the information in practice, with specific and actionable takeaways. • Content answers a unique question, describes a creative application of ABA-based strategies, or addresses a clearly specified practice issue or barrier with a well-articulated method. • The approach, system, or procedure is described in enough detail that it could be readily replicated by attendees in their own settings. • Data are included and complete (baseline and intervention/post data for more than one participant or unit of analysis, or a complete data set for the system or process described). • Consent statement is included where client, caregiver, or staff data or information will be presented. • No more than 2 presenters are listed.
4	• Abstract describes how attendees could use the information in practice. • Content answers a common question, demonstrates the application of commonly used ABA-based strategies, or generally identifies the practice issue or barrier addressed and the system, practice, process, or procedure used. • The approach could be replicated, though it may require organizational resources or leadership support that individual practitioners may not independently control. • Data are included but are in progress or incomplete (e.g., baseline complete and intervention underway, or partial outcome data for the system or process described). • Consent statement is included where client, caregiver, or staff data or information will be presented. • No more than 2 presenters are listed.
3	• Abstract is compelling but somewhat vague regarding how attendees could use the information in practice. • Content answers a question, describes an application of ABA-based strategies, or addresses an issue or barrier that may be relevant only to a subset of practitioners. • The approach is described but replication would be difficult for most practitioners (e.g., cost, staffing, or infrastructure demands), or the description is unclear in places. • No data are included, but the abstract clearly describes the outcomes observed and how the approach was evaluated. • Consent statement is included where client, caregiver, or staff data or information will be presented. • No more than 2 presenters are listed.
2	• Abstract is vague or unclear.

Score	Presentations
	• Content is related to a specific topic but does not answer a question, describe an application of ABA-based strategies, or clearly identify how the issue or barrier is addressed. • Replication is not feasible for attendees, or the approach depends on a proprietary product that must be purchased. • No data are included and outcomes are asserted without describing how the approach was evaluated. • No consent statement is provided where client, caregiver, or staff data or information will be presented. • More than 2 presenters are listed.
1	• Abstract is insufficient for review (not enough content, too short). • Content is too broad to be useful to attendees. • No data, outcomes, or method of evaluation are described in any form. • No consent statement is provided where client, caregiver, or staff data or information will be presented. • Presenters are not clearly identified.

Panels

A Panel brings together presenters to explore a common theme, issue, or question related to ABA practice or research. Panelists share their perspectives, expertise, and experiences while engaging one another and the audience in discussion. Panels include a Chair and 3–5 panelists depending on session duration. The Chair organizes and submits the proposal and facilitates the session by guiding discussion, posing questions to panelists, encouraging audience participation, and managing time. The Chair may also serve as a panelist.

Requirements: one Chair (may also serve as a panelist); maximum of 3 panelists for a 55-minute session or maximum of 5 panelists for an 80-minute session; at least 15 minutes reserved for audience participation; abstract must describe how audience participation will be facilitated; at least two sample discussion questions; no more than two panelists may represent the same institution, research project, association, or organization.

Score	Panels
5	• Abstract describes specifically how audience participation will be facilitated (e.g., soliciting questions before or during the panel, reserving time for audience Q&A, audience polls, addressing submitted questions throughout). • At least two sample discussion questions aimed at facilitating audience participation are provided. • The theme, issue, or question is well grounded in scientific evidence and/or has clear relevance to behavior-analytic practice. • All panelists represent different institutions, research projects, associations, or organizations. • At least 15 minutes are explicitly reserved for audience participation.
4	• Abstract states that audience participation will be facilitated by the Chair, but specific methods are not described. • At least two sample questions to be discussed by the panelists or the audience are provided. • The theme, issue, or question is consistent with established scientific knowledge and/or relevant to behavior-analytic practice. • No more than two panelists represent the same institution, research project, association, or organization. • At least 15 minutes are reserved for audience participation.
3	• Abstract references audience participation but provides insufficient detail to determine how participants will be actively engaged, or who is responsible for facilitating that engagement. • At least one sample question is provided that explicitly invites audience participation or discussion. • The theme, issue, or question has a reasonable scientific or practice-based rationale, but the connection to the evidence base or behavior-analytic practice is not fully developed. • No more than two panelists represent the same institution, research project, association, or organization. • Time reserved for audience participation is mentioned but not clearly specified.
2	• Abstract does not describe how audience participation will be facilitated. • The sample question(s) provided involve panelist discussion only, with no audience role. • The scientific or practical basis for the theme, issue, or question is weak or unclear; claims may rely primarily on opinion, anecdote, or unsupported assertions. • Three or more panelists represent the same institution, research project, association, or organization. • No time is reserved for audience participation.
1	• Abstract is insufficient for review (not enough content, too short). • No sample questions are provided.

Score	Panels
	• The theme, issue, or question lacks a credible scientific or practice-based foundation, includes pseudoscientific or demonstrably inaccurate claims, or has no discernible relevance to behavior analysis. • Panelist affiliations are unclear or not provided. • Panelist count falls outside the 3–5 range required for the requested duration. • No time is reserved for audience participation.

Symposia

A Symposium brings together a group of presenters to share a collection of related in-progress or completed research or applied work organized around a cohesive theme. Each symposium is coordinated by a Chair and includes a Discussant. The symposium abstract should clearly describe the overarching theme and how the individual studies or projects relate to one another.

Chair: The Chair typically organizes and coordinates the symposium submission materials and serves as the primary point of contact with APBA regarding the submission and presentation. During the symposium, the Chair opens the session, briefly introduces the overall theme and purpose of the symposium, introduces the presenters, manages time and transitions between presentations, and facilitates audience questions and discussion. The Chair may also serve as the Discussant or as a Presenter, but may not serve in all three roles.

Discussant: The Discussant typically concludes the symposium by providing commentary that connects and integrates themes across the presentations. The Discussant may highlight key findings or implications, identify commonalities or important distinctions across the presentations, and provide recommendations for future work, research, or analysis related to the symposium's overall theme. The Discussant may also raise questions or considerations that encourage further discussion among presenters and attendees. The Discussant may also serve as the Chair but may not present in the same symposium.

Requirements: a brief symposium abstract plus individual abstracts for each study or project; data are encouraged but not required. Available durations: 55 or 80 minutes.

Score	Symposia
5	• Abstract describes a clear and cohesive theme and explains how each project uniquely supports that theme. • An individual abstract is provided for every study or project and each is sufficient for review. • Each study or project demonstrates a strong scientific or scholarly foundation; the methods, data, and conclusions described are logically aligned and scientifically sound. • Data for each study or project are complete. • Role assignments comply with the Chair, Discussant, and Presenter requirements.
4	• Abstract describes the overall theme and how each individual presentation supports the theme. • An individual abstract is provided for every study or project. • Studies or projects demonstrate an appropriate scientific or scholarly foundation, with methods and conclusions generally supported by the information provided. • Data for each study or project include baseline and at least one intervention data point for one participant, or preliminary group or survey data. • Role assignments comply with the Chair, Discussant, and Presenter requirements.
3	• Abstract describes the overall theme and states that the individual presentations relate to it without describing how. • Individual abstracts are provided but one or more are minimal or unclear. • A scientific or scholarly basis is identifiable, but limitations in the information provided make it difficult to fully evaluate the rigor of one or more projects or the extent to which conclusions are supported. • Data for at least one project include baseline and at least one intervention data point for one participant, or preliminary group or survey data, but data are incomplete across the remaining projects. • Role assignments comply with the Chair, Discussant, and Presenter requirements.
2	• Abstract describes only the overall theme and does not address how the individual presentations relate to it. • One or more individual abstracts are missing.

Score	Symposia
	• The scientific or scholarly basis of one or more projects is weak or unclear; methods, evidence, or conclusions are insufficiently described or appear poorly aligned. • A statement regarding data completion is provided, but no data are submitted. • Role assignments do not comply with the Chair, Discussant, and Presenter requirements.
1	• Abstract is insufficient for review (not enough content, too short). • Individual abstracts are not provided. • A credible scientific or scholarly foundation cannot be identified, or the content relies on unsupported claims, pseudoscientific assertions, or conclusions that are inconsistent with the evidence presented. • No data are provided. • Roles are unclear or not identified.

Workshops

Workshops provide presenters with the opportunity to teach practical skills on a current topic important to the profession. Workshops should emphasize active learning and provide attendees with opportunities to practice, receive feedback, and develop resources they can immediately implement in practice. **This year, APBA will offer workshops at no additional cost to convention attendees to increase access to high-quality, hands-on, interactive learning experiences.**

Presenters are encouraged to design workshops so that approximately 40–50% of instructional time is devoted to participant engagement (e.g., behavioral skills training, guided practice, case-based application, role play, structured discussion, or supported development of practical tools and resources). Lecture or didactic instruction should provide the foundation for these activities rather than comprise the majority of the workshop.

Workshop submissions must clearly describe:

- The specific skills or competencies participants will acquire.
- How participants will practice the skills and receive feedback during the session.
- Materials provided (print and/or electronic) and any materials participants should bring.
- The intended audience experience level (e.g., beginner, intermediate, advanced).

Available durations: 2 hours or 3 hours. Workshops are offered throughout the three-day convention.

Score	Workshops
5	• Abstract clearly identifies specific, measurable skills or competencies participants will acquire. • Workshop design clearly demonstrates that approximately 40–50% of instructional time will be devoted to participant engagement, application, and feedback. • Participant engagement is intentionally designed and integrated throughout the workshop. • Participants leave with tangible products, tools, resources, or implementation plans that can be immediately applied in practice. • Materials provided, materials attendees should bring (if applicable), intended audience, and prerequisite knowledge are clearly described.
4	• Abstract clearly identifies the skills or competencies to be taught. • Workshop includes substantial opportunities for participant engagement and application, although the extent of engagement is less clearly described. • Participant engagement is intentionally incorporated throughout the workshop. • Practical resources or implementation guidance will be provided. • Intended audience and materials are clearly described.
3	• Abstract identifies the primary skills or knowledge that will be taught. • Workshop includes participant engagement, but how engagement supports learning is only generally described. • Practical takeaways are identified but not clearly articulated. • Audience and materials are identified but lack detail.
2	• Skills or competencies are vaguely described. • Participant engagement is mentioned but not adequately described. • Practical products or implementation supports are unclear. • Audience or materials are incomplete or omitted.
1	• Abstract is insufficient for review. • Skills to be taught are unclear.

Score	Workshops
	• Workshop appears to rely primarily on lecture or presentation with minimal participant engagement. • Intended audience and/or required materials are not identified.

ABA Expanded, Voices Amplified

ABA Expanded, Voices Amplified is a live-only submission type designed to broaden the conversations and perspectives represented at APBA's annual convention. It welcomes topics, formats, perspectives, and applications of behavior science that may fall outside traditional CEU-focused convention programming, including emerging areas of practice, interdisciplinary conversations, lived and professional perspectives, and thoughtful discussion of issues affecting the field and the communities it serves. Sessions of this type are not offered for CEUs or PDUs, are not livestreamed or recorded, and are available exclusively to in-person attendees.

Who this submission type is for

The updated BACB® ACE Handbook requires CEU content to be delivered by instructors who can document subject-matter expertise through a track record of published peer-reviewed research or books on the subject, at least five years of practical experience with the subject, at least three years of teaching or mentoring related to the subject, or a combination of these. Because ABA Expanded, Voices Amplified sessions do not offer continuing education credit, presenters are not required to meet BACB® ACE instructor qualifications.

APBA particularly welcomes students, early-career professionals, and behavior technicians, along with new voices in the field presenting at a national convention for the first time, self-advocates speaking to their own experience, family members and caregivers, practitioners working in emerging areas where a long track record is not yet possible, colleagues from adjacent disciplines, and community partners whose expertise comes from the work itself.

A note on behavior technicians: the Behavior Technician Track carries PDUs for RBT® certificants and consists of content designed for technicians delivered by behavior analysts. Technicians are the audience for that track rather than its presenters. ABA Expanded, Voices Amplified is the submission type through which a behavior technician can present.

Requirements: Submitters select a track as they would for any other submission type. Submissions close October 12, 2026 with the other non-poster types.

Sessions that fit this submission type

- Open forums and town halls on questions facing the field, where the goal is discussion rather than instruction.
- Thesis and dissertation presentations from graduate students sharing research in progress or recently defended.
- Interdisciplinary conversations with colleagues from speech-language pathology, occupational therapy, education, medicine, social work, or other adjacent fields.
- Sessions led by behavior technicians and frontline staff on implementation (strategies for session time management, stimuli preparation and organization, etc.)
- Sessions built around lived experience, including self-advocate, autistic adult, family, and caregiver perspectives.
- Emerging areas of practice where the evidence base and practice standards are still developing.
- Reflective case conversations, including sessions examining what did not work and what was learned.
- Community partner conversations about how behavior-analytic services are experienced outside the field.

Scoring rubric

ABA Expanded, Voices Amplified is intended to support thoughtful, constructive dialogue grounded in behavior analysis and/or the relevant experiences of those who receive, deliver, collaborate in, or are affected by behavior-analytic services. Sessions may explore differing perspectives or contested issues, but must do so in a manner that supports respectful professional dialogue and aligns with APBA's Code of Conduct.

Score	ABA Expanded, Voices Amplified
5	Strong fit — The submission is clearly grounded in behavior-analytic science or practice and/or relevant lived or professional experience; presents a meaningful, constructive topic with clear value to attendees; and is intentionally designed for thoughtful, interactive discussion.
4	Good fit — The submission has an appropriate grounding and a relevant topic with identifiable value to attendees. The session includes discussion or participation, although some aspects of the topic, value, or interactive format could be more fully developed.
3	Potential fit — The submission appears relevant to behavior analysis or the communities and professionals with whom behavior analysts interact, but its grounding, value to attendees, or plan for meaningful discussion is only broadly described.
2	Weak fit — The connection to behavior analysis, relevant lived/professional experience, or attendee value is unclear, and/or the proposed format does not demonstrate meaningful discussion or engagement.
1	Does not fit — The submission lacks a discernible connection to behavior analysis or relevant lived/professional experience; is insufficient for meaningful review; or relies primarily on rumor, gossip, unsupported allegations, personal grievances, disparagement, or content that does not support respectful and constructive professional dialogue.

Posters

Posters provide an opportunity to share data-based scholarly or applied work in a concise, interactive format. The 2027 Poster Session includes two components: a brief slide presentation followed immediately by an interactive visual poster session. Each accepted poster presenter gives a 3–5 minute presentation in the ballroom using a limited number of slides to introduce their work, highlight key findings, and share the primary takeaway. Following the brief presentations, presenters transition to their visual poster displays to engage with attendees, discuss their work, and answer questions.

Requirements: Content appropriate for both a brief 3–5 minute oral presentation and a visual poster display; accepted presenters prepare and bring their own poster, sized 36" x 24" or 24" x 48" to fit the poster boards provided; presenters are encouraged to prepare a brief slide show. Presenters are encouraged to take part in both components, but may opt out of the ballroom presentation.

Score	Posters
5	• Abstract clearly describes the purpose and design of the study or project and briefly summarizes the results. • Data are complete. • Results are clearly stated and can be communicated effectively in a 3–5 minute presentation. • Presenters identify a clear primary takeaway.
4	• Abstract clearly describes the purpose of the study or project. • Complete baseline data and at least one treatment data point for at least one participant are included. • Results are incomplete, but the topic is familiar enough to APBA audiences for the 3–5 minute presentation to be realistic. • Presenters can identify a likely primary takeaway.
3	• Abstract describes the purpose of the study or project, though some elements are underdeveloped. • Baseline data are complete, but treatment or outcome data are still in progress. • Data in progress, no results provided. Unable to determine if content can realistically be communicated within the timeframe.
2	• Abstract vaguely states the purpose of the study or project. • Data are present, but the dependent variable is not clearly aligned with the research question. • No results are provided and the abstract does not indicate what would be presented in the 3–5 minute session.
1	• Abstract is insufficient for review (not enough content, too short). • No data are provided. • No results or takeaways are described, so there is no basis to judge what would be presented.