

ASCILITE 2010 Advice for Reviewers

The Role of Reviewers

Reviewers provide an independent assessment of the quality of each paper submission. Whilst Reviewers have considerable latitude, and a considerable responsibility for interpretation of the concept of quality, we hope that the notes below will help us towards a reasonable uniformity of perception of quality standards, a fair, unbiased review process, and helpful, formative and constructive feedback for authors.

Papers under review and completed Review Forms are confidential and the contents are not to be revealed to other persons.

Double blind reviewing

ascilite Conferences use a double blind review process. That is, reviewers are not given the names and institutional affiliations of the authors, and authors are not given the names of the reviewers assigned to their article. If you feel that your objectivity as a Reviewer has been compromised because you have identified an author, either inadvertently through routine checking of references, or other avenues, please advise the Program Committee and we will seek a replacement reviewer if appropriate.

Ascilite2010 requires two double blind reviews for each full and concise paper, although in the event of non-arrival of a review, the Committee may elect to seek an additional review. Reviews may be supplemented, if appropriate, with non-blind reviews obtained from members of the Committee.

Selecting and appointing Reviewers

Reviewers are appointed on the basis of their expertise and experience in areas relevant for the Conference. It is an honorary role, being rewarded through acknowledgement in the online and USB drive versions of the *Conference Proceedings*. Each ascilite Conference relies to a large extent upon Reviewers commissioned from previous Conferences and Reviewers sought through sister organisational networks such as the Association of Learning Technology (ALT) in the United Kingdom. This has helped us sustain a uniformly high standard of reviewing over the years, as most of our Reviewers are 'experienced'. The ranks of 'experienced' Reviewers are supplemented from other sources, such as *AJET* reviewers and authors. It is not necessary for Reviewers to be members of ascilite, or to be registrants for the Conference. Ascilite Conferences also have an established policy of encouraging the induction of 'novice' Reviewers, who will broaden the Reviewer pool, and be in line to become the next generation of 'experienced' Reviewers. This policy is facilitated by ensuring, as best we can, that a review allocated to a 'novice' Reviewer is also allocated to 'experienced' Reviewers, and is backed up by Program Committee reviews, if appropriate.

The Review Process

Accessing papers and forms

We anticipate that each Reviewer will be allocated 2 to 3 papers, usually a mix of full and concise papers, made available on **Monday 12 July**, with a **due date Monday 2 August 2010**. You will be advised by email about your login name (it will be your email address) and password for your access to the Conference paper review system,

Whilst three weeks may seem to be a hectic deadline, it is the same as review process deadlines used for past Conferences. Given that ascilite Conferences offer authors the latest possible submission dates, it is essential that Reviewers maintain good turnaround times. If you find that you must call for help and seek re-allocation of all or part of the reviewing assigned to you, it will be vitally important to inform the Program Committee sooner rather than later!

After downloading and reading the papers assigned to you, we recommend that you compose your 'Summary of contribution' and 'Detailed comments' (see below) in your word processor. Save your composition for doing 'copy and paste' entries during your next login to the Conference paper review system. If using an *MS Word* format, keep it simple, because *MyReview* will record your entry in plain text format, and advice to authors will be made in plain text email. For example, separate paragraphs with a blank line and do not use the 'space after paragraph' facility; use asterisks instead of an automated, bulleted list; etc.

The review criteria

Reviewers use the criteria outlined below to assign ratings and make recommendations to the Committee on acceptance, conditional acceptance or rejection of submissions. Offers of acceptance specify a publication and presentation format, and include advice on any required or desirable revisions.

As with previous ascilite conferences, one of the purposes for the review process is to obtain DEEWR (2009) recognition of the work, in the *Conference publication* category. To this end, the Committee confirms that refereed proposals accepted for ascilite 2009 Conference publication will:

- Meet the definition of research in relation to creativity, originality, and increasing humanity's stock of knowledge;
- Be selected on the basis of a DEEWR compliant peer review process (independent, qualified expert review; double blind reviews conducted on the full articles, prior to publication);
- Be published and presented at a conference having national and international significance as evidenced by registrations and participation; and
- Be made available widely through the Conference web site (DEEWR, 2009).

Category	Description	Weight
Quality, of Research/Scholarship	<p>As appropriate for a full* or concise* paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The paper meets ARC standards ○ The paper reports on informed scholarship, critical reflection or empirical and evidence-based research ○ It demonstrates academic merit and appropriate critical analysis ○ It is situated in current literature and/or policy with a well articulated conceptual or theoretical framework and arguments ○ It adopts an appropriate research methodology with related research questions/aims for the purpose of the paper. <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It presents a synthesis or re-interpretation of existing research; a critique of practice development(s), theoretical arguments or conceptual frameworks; or a critical/reflective analysis 	40%
Originality & scholarly contribution	<p>As appropriate for a full* or concise* paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The paper is original, and clearly identifies broad and insightful implications for theory and/or policy and/or practice. ○ Insightful critical analysis and interpretation that leads to clear, logical findings, conclusions and implications for theory and/or policy and/or practice. 	35%
Relevance and suitability to ascilite 2010	The paper is relevant to ascilite 2010 conference theme, sub themes and to the intended audience.	15%
Quality of written presentation	The quality of written presentation demonstrates a high standard of writing, coherency and logical flow, ease of reading, attention to grammar and spelling and adherence to ascilite formatting and referencing guidelines.	10%

Applying the review criteria

You will have to use your own best judgment on the four criteria listed above, weighted as shown. For each criterion you will be asked to select a rating from the seven point scale:

Strong Accept	Accept	Weak Accept	Neutral	Weak Reject	Reject	Strong Reject
---------------	--------	-------------	---------	-------------	--------	---------------

A guide to the standard anticipated for three of these ratings (Strong Accept, Weak Accept and Reject) is provided below.

Rating the papers:

The following sections provide a guide to assigning a rating for three of the seven selection criteria.

Quality of research/ Scholarship

Strong Accept: The informed scholarship, critical reflection or empirical and evidence-based research outlined in the paper meets ARC standards (It outlines the topic in relation to creativity, originality, and increasing humanity's stock of knowledge). This criterion also evaluates the academic merit of the paper, whether the level of critical analysis is appropriate, whether the paper is situated in contemporary literatures with a well-defined conceptual or theoretical framework with relevant research questions/aims/arguments, and finally, whether the authors adopt a research methodology or critical analysis that is fit for the purpose of the paper/study.

Weak Accept: Situated in the university context with limited but relevant connection to teaching and learning literature and/or policy, demonstrating some linkage to research question or theoretical framework. Appropriate methodology or critical analysis.

Reject: Knowledge of literature and /or policy context is not demonstrated or integrated into the paper. Methodology lacks academic rigor, or paper lacks appropriate analysis and insight.

Originality and scholarly contribution

Strong Accept The paper is original, provides insightful critical analysis and clearly identifies broad and insightful implications for theory, practice and/or policy. The paper presents feasible propositions, inferences and conclusions that are consistent with research study /conceptual/ theoretical limitations

Weak Accept: The paper requires further analysis and interpretation. Findings and conclusions require more clarification. The paper draws basic implications for other practitioners. The scholarly contribution of the paper may need to be further substantiated as valid and trustworthy.

Reject: The paper does not extend beyond its immediate context or over-extends its scope in terms of what can realistically be applied beyond the immediate context. Findings, conclusions and implications are ambiguous or unsupported. Substantial components of the paper (including the same data set) have been published elsewhere.

Relevance and suitability to ascilite2010

The theme of ascilite 2010 is Curriculum, technology & transformation for an unknown future. Papers and presentations are invited that explore developments, experiences and future possibilities in the following areas:

- leadership, policy and strategy
- learners, learning and educational practice
- academic development practices
- industry relationships
- mobility of learners, teachers and workers
- innovation and technology

You are encouraged to examine the information on the website about each of the sub-themes (see <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/cfp.htm>). Prospective authors who are not familiar with ascilite Conferences are also advised to spend some time browsing previous proceedings available from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/index.php?p=conference> to help ascertain the suitability of a potential submission. The paper should be relevant for the target audience which includes educational practitioners, tertiary sector leaders, government and ministry officials, managers, ICT professionals, researchers, private training organisations and secondary and vocational education representatives and members of the wider Australasian and international higher education community.

Strong Accept: Clear relevance to one or more of the conference themes. Relevant to several delegate groups.

Weak Accept: Relevant to at least one conference theme and relevant to at least some delegate groups.

Reject: Lacks sufficient relevance to conference theme and/or any of the sub-themes, or to any of the delegate groups.

Quality of written presentation

Strong Accept: The paper conforms to a high standard of academic writing, and demonstrates a coherency and logical flow. It is easy for the reader to follow and grammar, spelling and referencing standards and guidelines are followed.

Weak Accept: The paper is of an acceptable standard of academic writing but requires some attention to coherency and flow and/or ease of readership and/or grammar, spelling and referencing standards and guidelines.

Reject: The paper is poorly written and the argument or logic is difficult to follow. Grammar, spelling and referencing standards and guidelines have not been followed.

Completing the paper review process:

After allocating ratings to each of the criterion for the paper under review, you will be asked to 'self rate' on a three point 'Reviewer's expertise' scale.

Next you will find two free form text entry boxes:

1. Summary of contribution. Please provide one to several sentences summarising your overall impression and recommendation (you do not have to summarise the paper).

2. Detailed comments. In plain text format, these will be the principal formative feedback. Here you should specify revisions that are to be completed to improve the quality of the paper. You could give amplifying comments and brief, illustrative examples to help authors understand the summative judgments that have informed your review criteria ratings. Please remember that the aim here is to encourage authors to improve their work, not only for this Conference, but also for future conference and journal submissions. It is a section in which you can emphasise 'how you may progress...', in contrast to emphasising 'your work is bad because...'. Another aim in this section is to alert the Proceedings editors to minor or major revisions that they should check, upon receiving a revised version from the authors. Owing to production time constraints, it won't be possible to send revised versions to the original or new Reviewers.

The detailed comments text entry box is followed by the Yes or No question, "Candidate for the best paper award?" This item provides the Program Committee with a basis for compiling a short list for determining one to several Outstanding Paper Awards. In general, for 'Yes' the 'average' rating will be higher than midway between 'Accept' and 'Strong Accept'. Both 'Full' and 'Concise' papers may be eligible.

Comments for Program Committee (not shown to the authors) is another free form text entry box, where you may add any special, confidential comments for 'Program Committee eyes only', that may assist the Program Committee with the selection process, and in using its discretion when providing feedback to authors. Other matters that you may raise could include alerting the Committee to instances of excessive repetition of previously published work, or inadequate acknowledgment of the work of other writers. If you feel it is appropriate, in this text entry box you may recommend that Committee consider offering acceptance in the poster category.

In some cases, the Reviewer may feel that it is appropriate to recommend to the Program Committee that the authors be offered a format differing from the format they nominated, e.g., an outstanding 'Concise' paper may be given a 'Traditional' 25 minute presentation slot. However, please note that some changes of format cannot be offered. For example, changes from 'Concise' to 'Full' in publication format cannot be offered. Also, changes from 'Full' to 'Concise' should be recommended only in exceptional cases where the paper could be substantially improved by a major revision with shortening. Papers submitted as 'Full' or 'Concise' which are recommended by Reviewers for acceptance in the 'Poster' category, or for which the Program Committee decides to offer 'Poster', may by negotiation be published at a length greater than two pages, if the

authors so desire, upon accepting a 'Poster' offer.

Detailed descriptive statistics about review process outcomes for full and short papers submitted to ascilite Conferences in previous years may be obtained from the editorials appearing in each Proceedings, from 2004 to 2009 inclusive.

If you have academic or technical questions about the review process, please email info@ascilite.org.au.