# ATN Assessment 2010: Sustainability, Diversity, and Innovation
## Information for Reviewers (Updated 16 August 2010)

- **Introduction**
- **The role of the reviewer**
- **Double blind reviewing**
- **Appointment and acknowledgement of reviewers**
- **Registering as a reviewer**
- **The review process**
- **Rating the papers**
- **Making recommendations for publication**
- **Providing feedback to the authors**

## Introduction

Thank you for contributing to the conference as a reviewer. You are helping to implement a rigorous double blind peer review for papers submitted to the ATN Assessment Conference 2010.  The overall theme of this conference is **Assessment: Sustainability, Diversity, and Innovation**. Topics include:

- Assessment for sustainable learning within and beyond the course
- Sustainable assessment practices and standards
- Innovative assessment: opportunities and challenges
- Diversity and assessment: diverse students and diverse assessment practices.

## The role of the reviewer

The role of the ATN Assessment reviewer is threefold:
- to ensure that papers recommended for publication meet DEEWR standards of research;
- to provide formative feedback to the author/s; and
- to be objective in rating papers.

In brief, the DEEWR 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

ATN Assessment conferences use a double blind review process that meets DEEWR 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 the conference convenors at atn.assessment@uts.edu.au and the paper will be reassigned.

## 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 and online reviewing system

Papers will be made available for review from mid-August on the ATN Assessment Conference online submission system www.conferenceonline.com.au . A reviewer account has already been set up for you. Once papers have been allocated, you will receive an email letting you know that papers are ready for review, and the proposed timelines. An email notification of your login/password has been sent to you.   If you have not received this, please email atn.assessment@uts.edu.au to receive your login details. Your feedback to the authors and recommendations to the conference committee should be completed and submitted online by 9:00am on September 3rd 2010.  All reviewers are required to respect the confidentiality of the process.

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

- Suitability for conference presentation, i.e. relevance to conference themes and to the intended audience;
- Academic merit including contribution to scholarship, originality, and use of relevant literature;
- Clear and coherent description of aims and background, methodology/ evaluation processes, framework for critique, findings and conclusions;
- Implications for practice, theory and/or policy;
- Standard of academic writing and presentation writing.

On the online system, there is a box to add a comment against each criterion. There is also a box where you may provide global formative comments for the authors, so that they may improve their paper, and you may also wish to provide comments for the committee alone. Please note clearly, where the comments are to be read only by the committee.

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 will advise the convenors whether or not a paper rejected for a refereed publication would still be suitable for presentation. The convenors will receive the two reviews for each paper, determine the final position if reviews are substantially different, (in some cases a third review will be called for), advise the author of the decision, and release your comments to the author.

## Rating the papers
A reviewer's sheet, will be made available on the conference website closer to the submission date. It may be printed to help with the review process when you are not working near your computer. However note that all review ratings and comments must be sent through the online submission system.

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 as specified on the welcome page.

| 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. |

## 2. Academic merit
This criterion relates to appropriateness of the level of scholarship, originality, and the use of relevant literature.

| 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). |
|---|---|
| Accept | Situated in the literature and/or policy linked to clearly elaborated research questions. |
| 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. |
| Neutral or Weak Reject or Reject or Strong Reject | Knowledge of literature and /or policy context is not demonstrated or integrated into the paper. |

## 3. Methodology, quality of argument, evaluation processes, findings, and conclusions
This criterion relates to the appropriateness and clarity of description of the research or evaluation methods used, and the presentation of findings, or conclusions.

| | |
|---|---|
| Strong Accept | Adopts an appropriate research methodology, or framework for critique, for the purpose of the paper with insightful critical analysis and interpretation. The methodology is clearly and coherently described. |
| Accept | Adopts an appropriate research methodology for the purpose of the paper with satisfactory evidence of critical analysis and interpretation. The methodology is clearly and coherently described. |
| Weak Accept | Appropriate methodology described with elementary analysis. |
| Neutral or Weak Reject or Reject or Strong Reject | Methodology lacks academic rigour, or paper lacks appropriate analysis and insight |

## 4. 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 |

## 5. Standard of academic writing and presentation.
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, 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. |

### Making recommendations for publication
The following is a guide for making recommendations for inclusion into the conference and publication in the conference proceedings. You may need to use your discretion in applying this guide.

A. 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.
B. 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 limit on paper length.
C. 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.
D. Reject the paper or proposal where you feel that it does match the required standard for this conference, and suggest submission as a poster.

**Providing feedback to the authors**
Please provide global feedback to the author(s) that relates to the recommendation that you gave.

A. 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.

B. 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.

C. 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.

D. Papers rejected for inclusion as a presentation or workshop should be given feedback on the positive qualities and the areas for improvement for (i) a poster presentation and (ii) publication or conferences at a later date.