



## HERDSA 2010 Information for Reviewers

The Convener and Organising Committee of HERDSA 2010 are extremely grateful for the work of reviewers in assuring the high quality of submissions to the conference. This document sets out the role of the reviewer and the associated processes.

### 1. The role of the reviewer

The role of the HERDSA reviewer is threefold:

- To ensure that papers recommended for publication meet Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) standards of research
- To provide formative feedback to the author/s
- To be objective in rating submissions

In brief, DEEWR standards for research include pure basic research, strategic basic research, applied research and experimental development research. 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 [terry.mccormick@deakin.edu.au](mailto:terry.mccormick@deakin.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. Overview of the review process

Submissions will be made available to reviewers via the online submission and review system in late February 2010. Once papers are allocated, you will receive an email containing a username and password for the review system and further instructions about the process.

**The deadline for the completion of reviews is 11.55 pm AEDST 31 March 2010.** Due to our tight timelines, we will be unable to grant extensions to this deadline. All reviews must be submitted using the [online submission and review system](#).

There are four options for submissions to the HERDSA 2010 conference:

1. Full refereed papers (see Section 5)
2. Showcases (see Section 6)
3. Pre-conference workshops (see Section 7)
4. Posters (see Section 6)

Sections 5, 6, and 7 of this document provide detailed information about the requirements of the review process.



## 5. The review process for full refereed papers

From the home page of the review system, click the 'reviewers' tab and enter the username and password that were emailed to you and click the 'Log in' button. A list of the papers/abstracts for review will be displayed.

Use the 'download' link to obtain the relevant file, and, once you have read and reviewed the paper, use the 'submit my review' link to enter your review. Please note that it is recommended that you prepare and save your review in a text file and copy and paste the review into the review system once it is finalised. The review system accepts plain text only. Any formatting will be lost when you submit your review. You can update a review at any time prior to the deadline by accessing the review system and clicking the 'update my review' link that appears once you have commenced entering a review.

When reviewing the submissions, you are required to:

1. Rate the submission against the following selection criteria (see section 5.1 for more information) by selecting the appropriate option from each drop down list:
  - a. **Originality** and implications for practice, theory and/or policy
  - b. **Quality** of academic merit, including contribution to scholarship, critical analysis and research methods
  - c. **Relevance** to the conference theme, sub-themes and to the intended audience
  - d. **Presentation** and standard of writing, use of templates and adherence to formatting guidelines
2. Select the appropriate option from the 'recommendation' drop down list (see section 5.2) to advise the Organising Committee about whether or not the submission is of a standard acceptable for the refereed proceedings
3. Indicate a self assessment of your expertise in the topic area of the submission by selecting the appropriate option from the 'reviewer's expertise' drop down list
4. Provide detailed comments on the paper for the authors (see section 5.3)
5. Provide a rationale for your recommendation to the Organising Committee (see section 5.4)
6. Enter your first and last name in the fields provided and click the 'submit' button

### 5.1 Rating the papers

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

#### 5.1.1 Originality

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 with revisions	The paper draws basic implications for other practitioners.
Reject	The paper does not extend beyond its immediate context.



### 5.1.2 Quality

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

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 with revisions	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.
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.

### 5.1.3 Relevance

In this criterion you need to be aware of the [conference theme \*Reshaping Higher Education\*](#) and the sub-themes:

- Policy
- Academic practice
- Research
- Leadership
- Student outcomes

More information about each of the sub-themes can be found on the HERDSA 2010 website. The paper must address the theme and/or sub-themes of the conference. It should also be relevant for the target audience which includes 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.

Accept	Clear or strong contemporary relevance to one or more of the conference themes. Relevant to several audience groups.
Accept with revisions	Relevant to at least one conference theme and relevant to at least some audience members.
Reject	Lacks sufficient relevance to any of the conference theme and/or sub-themes, or to any of the audience groups.



### 5.1.4 Presentation

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

Accept	All aspects of the written work conform to a high academic standard. The paper is highly readable and logical. The author/s has/have adhered to guidelines for formatting and referencing.
Accept with revisions	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.
Reject	This paper is difficult to read and/or the argument or logic is difficult to follow at times.

### 5.2 Making a recommendation

The following is a guide for making recommendations for publication. You may need to use your discretion in applying this guide. Select the appropriate recommendation from the drop down list entitled 'Recommendations'.

Accept	This option should be selected for high quality, original and relevant papers that adhere to presentation guidelines and address the conference theme or sub-themes. Reviewers should point out any minor spelling, grammatical or formatting errors to authors as necessary.
Accept with revisions	This option should be selected if a paper is of an acceptable academic standard, with some presentation issues. The paper must address the conference theme or sub-themes and less than 20 per cent of the paper should need re-working to achieve a high quality, original, relevant and well presented final submission.
Reject	This option should be selected where you feel that more than 20 per cent of the paper needs re-working and the paper does not match the required standard for a HERDSA conference paper.

### 5.3 Providing feedback to the authors

Please provide detailed 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 the author(s) know if they will need to attend to spelling, grammar or formatting issues
2. Papers accepted with minor revisions should be given feedback on both the positive qualities and the areas that need improvement. Please let the author(s) know if, in addition, they will need to attend to spelling, grammar or formatting
3. Papers that are rejected should be given feedback on the positive qualities and the areas for improvement for presentation and/or publication in another forum

### 5.4 Providing feedback to the Organising Committee

Please provide a rationale for your recommendation and any other pertinent comments to the Organising Committee in the 'comments for the Organising Committee' field.



## 6. The review process for showcases and posters

Showcases and posters are reviewed on the basis of a 500 word abstract. Please note that it is recommended that you prepare and save your review in a text file and copy and paste the review into the review system once it is finalised. The review system accepts plain text only. Any formatting will be lost when you submit your review. In reviewing these submissions, you are required to:

1. Consult the showcase or poster [submission guidelines on the HERDSA 2010 website](#) to ensure all guidelines have been met. Please use the following selection criteria (detailed in section 5.1) with the consideration that you are only using an abstract as the basis of your assessment:
  - a. **Originality** and implications for practice, theory and/or policy
  - b. **Quality** of academic merit, including contribution to scholarship, critical analysis and research methods
  - c. **Relevance** to the conference theme, sub-themes and to the intended audience
  - d. **Presentation** and standard of writing, use of templates and adherence to formatting guidelines
2. Select the appropriate option from the 'recommendation' drop down list (see section 5.2) to advise the Organising Committee whether the submission is of a standard acceptable for inclusion in the conference program
3. Indicate a self assessment of your expertise in the topic area of the submission by selecting the appropriate option from the 'reviewer's expertise' drop down list
4. Provide detailed comments on the abstract for the showcase or poster for the authors (see section 5.3)
5. Provide a rationale for your recommendation to the Organising Committee (see section 5.4)
6. Enter your first and last name in the fields provided and click the 'submit' button

## 7. The review process for pre-conference workshops

A workshop is an integrated, interactive engagement between the presenters and the audience. Workshops are reviewed on the basis of 500 word abstract. Please note that it is recommended that you prepare and save your review in a text file and copy and paste the review into the review system once it is finalised. The review system accepts plain text only. Any formatting will be lost when you submit your review. In reviewing these submissions, you are required to:

1. Consult the pre-conference workshop submission guidelines on the website to ensure all guidelines have been met and then consider the following preferred attributes for a workshop:
  - a. Topic reflects an emerging issue in policy, practice or research and outlines the topic's significance to the conference theme
  - b. Links to literature are made in order to show the standpoint from which the session will be presented
  - c. Focus of the discussion is a clearly identified and describes the presenters focus and involvement
  - d. An indication that the presenters will engage with each other (where relevant) and with the audience (e.g. have described the format of the session and set out the strategies which will be used to ensure audience participation)
2. Select the appropriate option from the 'recommendation' drop down list (see section 5.2) to advise the Organising Committee whether the submission is of a standard acceptable for inclusion in the conference program



3. Indicate a self assessment of your expertise in the topic area of the submission by selecting the appropriate option from the 'reviewer's expertise' drop down list
4. Provide detailed comments on the paper for the authors (see section 5.3)
5. Provide a rationale for your recommendation to the Organising Committee (see section 5.4)
6. Enter your first and last name in the fields provided and click the 'submit' button

### 8. Queries about the review process

If reviewers have queries or comments about the review process, they are welcome to contact the Conference Convener for clarification:

**Professor Marcia Devlin**

HERDSA 2010 Convener and Chair in Higher Education Research

Deakin University

Melbourne Campus at Burwood

221 Burwood Highway

Burwood VIC 3125

Australia

Email: [marcia.devlin@deakin.edu.au](mailto:marcia.devlin@deakin.edu.au)

Phone: +61 3 9251 7092