

HERDSA 2009 Information for reviewers

1. The role of the reviewer

The role of the HERDSA reviewers is threefold:

- To ensure that papers recommended for publication meet DEST standards of research.
- To provide formative feedback to the author/s; and
- To be objective in rating submissions.

In brief, 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.

2. Double blind reviewing

HERDSA conferences use a double blind review process that meets 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 herdsa2009@cdu.edu.au, and the paper will be reassigned.

3. 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.

4. The review process overview

There are two submission dates. Submissions will be made available at the beginning of December 2008 and March 2009. Once they have been allocated, you will receive an email letting you know that the submissions are ready for review. All reviews must be completed by 16th of those months. All reviewers must respect the confidentiality of the process.

You will need to complete and submit review reports by using the Paper Submission and Review System on the HERDSA 2009 conference website available at <http://herdsa.cdu.edu.au/>. Please note the conference convenors and program co-ordinator has already completed a check on the word counts for each category.

5. The review process for papers – full and concise

In reviewing the submissions, you are required to:

- 1 Indicate a self assessment of your expertise in the topic area of the submission
- 2 Rate the submission against the following selection criteria (see section 5.1 for more information):
 - **Originality** and implications for practice, theory and/or policy;
 - **Quality** of academic merit, including contribution to scholarship, critical analysis, research methods;
 - **Relevance** for conference presentation, i.e. relevance to conference themes and to the intended audience;
 - **Standard of writing/presentation.**
- 3 Provide global formative comments on the paper for the authors (see section 5.2).
- 4 Complete the recommendation section to advise the Programme Committee whether the submission is of a standard acceptable for the refereed proceedings and provide comments to the Programme Committee (see section 5.3). Please note that any paper rejected for a refereed publication will still be considered for presentation at the conference as a non-refereed contribution. The Programme Committee requests your advice as to whether or not a paper rejected for a refereed publication would still be suitable for presentation as a showcase or poster.

All this information needs to be entered into the online form available when you login to the Paper Submission and Review System. You can enter ratings and recommendation by using drop down boxes. The comments to the authors and the Programme Committee, however, need to be typed in. You may choose to type your comments in directly, or to cut and paste them across, formatting may not be reproduced on the form. Please note that if you type them in directly, the window scrolls and there is a limit of 4000 characters in these sections.

5.1. Rating the papers

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

1. Originality and Implications for theory, practice and/or policy.

Strong Accept	The paper is original, and 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.

2. Quality

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 question. 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 question. 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. Relevance to conference theme, sub themes and intended audience

In this criterion you need to be aware of the conference themes (The Student Experience) 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 theme is: The Student Experience

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.

4. Presentation.

The descriptors to aid you in assigning rating for this criterion are as follows.

Strong Accept	All aspects of the written work conform to a high academic standard, i.e., 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, i.e., 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.

5.2. Providing feedback to the authors

Please provide global feedback to the author/s that relates to your recommendation.

- 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 both 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-referred 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.

5.3. Suitability for publication

The following is a guide for making recommendations for publication. You may need to use your discretion in applying this guide. Enter your recommendation in the drop down box titled recommendations

- 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 referred article.
- 4 Reject the paper or proposal where you feel that it does not match the required standard for HERDSA presentation.

Please also add any comments about your reasoning for making your conclusion in the comments for the program committee section at the top part of the review submission form.

6. The review process for Showcases and Posters

Showcases and posters are reviewed on the basis of an abstract only with a maximum of 500 words. In reviewing these submissions, you are required to:

- 1 Indicate a self assessment of your expertise in the topic area of the submission
 - 2 Rate them against the following selection criteria:
 - **Originality** and implications for practice, theory and/or policy;
 - **Quality** of academic merit, including contribution to scholarship, critical analysis, research methods;
 - **Relevance** for conference presentation, i.e. relevance to conference themes and to the intended audience;
 - **Standard of writing/presentation.**
- Please use the rating suggestion outlined in section 5.1 with the consideration that you are only using an abstract as the basis of your assessment.
- 2 Provide global formative comments on the paper for the authors (see section 5.2).
 - 3 Complete the recommendations section to indicate if you feel the submission should be accepted or rejected.
 - 4 Provide comments about your decision to the Programme Committee in the “comments for the program committee” section at the top part of the review submission form.

7. The review process for Workshops

Workshops are reviewed on the basis of an abstract only with a maximum of 500 words. A workshop is an integrated, interactive engagement between the presenters and the audience. In reviewing these submissions, you are required to:

- 1 Indicate a self assessment of your expertise in the topic area of the submission
- 2 Consider the following preferred attributes for a workshop:
 - topic reflects an emerging issue in policy, practice or research and outlines the topic's significance to the conference theme
 - links to literature are made in order to show the standpoint from which the session will be presented
 - focus of the discussion is a clearly identified and describes the presenters focus and involvement
 - identify how the presenters will engage with each other and with the audience (eg describe the format of the session and set out the strategies which will be used to ensure audience participation).
- 3 Provide global formative comments on the workshop for the authors addressing any of the points above.
- 4 Complete the recommendations section to indicate if you feel the submission should be accepted or rejected.
- 5 Provide comments to the Programme Committee about the value of the workshop to the conference based on an overall judgement from the preferred attributes listed above. Also indicate whether you think the workshop should form part of the preconference workshop sessions or would be of value to be incorporated into the actual conference program.