

# ATN Assessment 2010: Sustainability, Diversity, and Innovation Information for Reviewers –Short Papers, Workshops, and Posters.

## Introduction

Thank you for contributing to the conference as a reviewer. You are helping to implement a peer review process 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:

- to ensure that conference presentations will include material of an acceptable standard
- to provide formative feedback to the author/s; and
- to be objective in rating papers.

## Anonymous reviewing

Reviewers will receive a paper devoid of the authors' names 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](mailto: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 on the ATN Assessment Conference online submission system [www.conferenceonline.com.au](http://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](mailto: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;
- Appropriate level of scholarship, and use of relevant literature;
- Clear and coherent description of aims and background, methodology/ evaluation processes, framework for critique, other framework, findings and conclusions;
- Implications for practice, theory and/or policy.

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. As these are 500-1000 word extended abstracts only, some authors may have difficulty compressing their work within this word limit. In your comments, you may wish to note insights or findings which you think are of particular interest to the conference attendees so that these issues are focused on in the presentations.

Please note that any papers rejected as a short-paper presentation will still be considered for a poster presentation. 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 is available on the conference website. 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. Appropriate level of scholarship

This criterion relates to appropriateness of the level of scholarship, 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
Accept	Situated in literature and/or policy linked to research questions, or current issues/practice
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 or current issues/practice
Neutral or Weak Reject or Reject or Strong Reject	Knowledge of literature and /or policy context and/or current issues/practice is not demonstrated or integrated into the paper.

#### 3. Short Papers: Clear and coherent description of the practice, or research progress and findings; Workshops – Clear and coherent description of workshop aims, methods for actively involving participants, and intended participant outcomes; Posters – Clear description of the practice, innovation, or work in progress.

This criterion relates to the appropriateness and clarity of description and the presentation of findings

Strong Accept	Adopts an appropriate methodology, framework for critique, or evaluation for the purpose of the paper/poster with insightful critical analysis and interpretation  Workshop: clear description of workshop aims, methods for actively involving participants and intended participant outcomes
Accept	Adopts an appropriate methodology or framework for the purpose of the paper with satisfactory evidence of analysis and interpretation. The approach is clearly and coherently described.

	Workshop: Reasonable description of workshop aims, methods for actively involving participants and intended participant outcomes – but some finetuning required
Weak Accept	Appropriate methodology/ framework is described with elementary analysis and insights  Workshop: Reasonable aims, but needs development on the basis of feedback
Neutral or Weak Reject or Reject or Strong Reject	Methodology lacks academic rigour, or paper lacks appropriate analysis/ critique/ insights Workshop – Aims unclear and/or approach unclear

#### 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 have implications beyond the immediate context

#### 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 poster where you feel that the audience would benefit from the material, but it does not warrant a presentation.
- D. Reject the paper or proposal where you feel that it does not match the required standard for this conference.

#### 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 poster should be given feedback on the positive qualities and the reason their paper was not suitable as a presentation. 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 poster 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.