# Information for Reviewers HERDSA 2007

## The role of the reviewer

The role of the HERDSA reviewer is threefold:

(i)      to ensure that papers recommended for publication meet DEST standards of research;

(ii)      to provide formative feedback to the author/s; and

(iii)      to be objective in rating papers.

In brief, the DEST standards for research include pure basic research, strategic basic research, applied research and experimental development. They require that the paper be original and have the potential to produce results that are sufficiently general for theoretical and/or practical knowledge to be recognisably increased. Most higher education research work would qualify as research.

## Double blind reviewing

HERDSA conferences use a double blind review process that meets DEST requirements for peer review of research publications. Reviewers will receive a paper devoid of the authors' names and institutions in order to ensure objectivity and anonymity. If you think your objectivity has been compromised by inadvertently identifying an author, please email herdsa2007@adelaide.edu.au, and the paper will be reassigned.

## Becoming a reviewer

Papers will be made available at the end of March 2007. **All reviews must be completed by 4 May 2007.** All reviewers must respect the confidentiality of the process.

Review reports will be completed and submitted online at:
http://andy.services.adelaide.edu.au/herdsa07/Review.php

## Appointment and acknowledgement of reviewers

Reviewers are appointed on the basis of their expertise and experience in areas relevant to the conference. All reviewers will be acknowledged in the published proceedings.

## The review process

The review process is managed through the HERDSA conference website, http://andy.services.adelaide.edu.au/herdsa07/Review.php. Once papers have been allocated, you will receive an email letting you know that papers are ready for review.

In reviewing the papers you will be required to rate them on the basis of:

- Suitability for conference presentation, ie relevance to conference themes and to the intended audience;
- Academic merit including contribution to scholarship, originality, critical analysis, research methods;
- Implications for practice, theory and/or policy;
- Standard of writing.

You will also be required to provide global formative comments on the paper for the

authors. If you wish, you may also provide comments for the Program Committee alone.

Please note that any papers rejected for a refereed publication will still be considered for presentation at the conference as a non-refereed contribution. You may wish to advise the Program Committee whether or not a paper rejected for a refereed publication would still be suitable for presentation.

All this information needs to be entered into the online form available through your login. The ratings are entered through the use of drop down boxes. The comments to the authors and the Program Committee, however, need to be typed in. You may choose to type your comments in directly, or to cut and paste them across. Please note that if you type them in directly, the window scrolls.

## Rating the papers

The following is a guide to assigning a rating under each of the criteria:

### 1. Relevance to conference theme and intended audience
In this criterion you need to be aware of the conference themes and the target audience (refer below for further information).

| Strong Accept | Clear or strong contemporary relevance to one or more of the conference themes. Relevant to several audience groups. |
|---|---|
| Accept | Relevant to one or more conference themes and relevant to at least one audience group. |
| Weak Accept | Relevant to at least one conference theme and relevant to at least some audience members. |
| Neutral or Weak Reject or Reject or Strong reject | Lacks sufficient relevance to any of the conference themes, or to any of the audience groups. |

The conference themes are:
1. Theoretical frameworks of learning and teaching in higher education
2. Scholarship of learning and teaching
3. Translating the theory and scholarship of learning and teaching into meaningful student experiences

The target audience is academics, researchers, students, organisational and academic developers, professionals, technical staff, university managers, policy makers and members of the wider national and international higher education community.

### 2. Academic merit
This criterion relates to how the paper is situated in the literature and / or policy.

| Strong Accept | Clearly situated in current literature and/or policy with well articulated conceptual or theoretical framework and related research questions that address a novel issue(s). Adopts an appropriate research methodology for the purpose of the paper with insightful critical analysis and interpretation. |
|---|---|

| Accept | Situated in the literature and/or policy linked to clearly elaborated research questions. Adopts an appropriate research methodology for the purpose of the paper with evidence of critical analysis and interpretation. |
|---|---|
| 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 questions. Appropriate methodology with elementary analysis. |
| Neutral or Weak Reject or Reject or Strong reject | Knowledge of literature and /or policy context is not demonstrated or integrated into the paper. Methodology lacks academic rigour, or paper lacks appropriate analysis and insight. |

## 3. Implications for theory, practice and/or policy.

| Strong Accept | The paper clearly identifies broad and insightful implications for theory practice and/or policy that are consistent with study limitations and the inferences and conclusions it draws. |
|---|---|
| Accept | The paper provides clear implications for practice, policy and /or further research. |
| Weak Accept | The paper draws basic implications for other practitioners. |
| Neutral or Weak Reject or Reject or Strong reject | The paper does not extend beyond the immediate context. |

## 4. Standard of writing.
The descriptors to aid you in assigning ratings for this criterion are as follows.

| Strong Accept | All aspects of the written work conform to a high academic standard, ie, the paper is highly readable and logical. Guidelines for formatting and referencing are adhered to. |
|---|---|
| Accept | Most aspects of the written work conform to a high academic standard, ie, overall, the paper is logical and easy to read. |
| Weak Accept | Most aspects of the written work conform to an acceptable academic standard. While the paper may be difficult to read at times, overall it retains logic. |
| Neutral or Weak Reject or Reject or Strong reject | This paper is difficult to read and/or the argument or logic is difficult to follow at times. |

## Making recommendations for publication

The following is a guide for making recommendations for publication. You may need to use your discretion in applying this guide.

1. Accept paper as is. Do not worry about the odd minor spelling, grammatical or formatting errors. All accepted authors will be required to ensure that their final submitted paper adheres to all these requirements in order to be published.

2. Accept the paper with minor revisions where you feel less than 20% of the paper needs re-working and / or where the paper needs to be reduced to fit the word limit.
3. Accept the paper (with or without minor revisions) as a non-refereed presentation where you feel that the audience would benefit from the presentation but it does not warrant publication as a refereed article.
4. Reject the paper or proposal where you feel that it does match the required standard for a HERDSA presentation.

## Proving feedback to the authors

Please provide global feedback to the author/s that relates to the recommendation that you gave.
1. Papers accepted as is should be given feedback on the positive qualities of the paper. Please let them know if they will need to attend to spelling, grammar or formatting.
2. Papers accepted with minor revisions should be given feedback on the positive qualities and the areas for improvement. Also please let them know if, in addition, they will need to attend to spelling, grammar or formatting.
3. Papers accepted as a non-refereed presentation should be given feedback on the positive qualities and the reason their paper was not suitable as a refereed contribution. Also please let them know if, in addition, they will need to attend to spelling, grammar or formatting.
4. Papers rejected for publication should be given feedback on the positive qualities and the areas for improvement for (i) presentation and (ii) publication at a later date.