

# **UniServe Science Conference 2009 - Information for Reviewers**

## **1. The role of the reviewer**

The role of the reviewers is threefold:

- To ensure that papers recommended for publication meet DEST/DEEWR (2008) standards of research.
- To provide formative feedback to the author/s; and
- To be objective in rating submissions.

In brief, DEST/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.

## **2. Double blind reviewing**

UniServe Science 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 objectively and anonymity. If you think your objectivity has been compromised by inadvertently identifying an author, please email [uniserveedit@usyd.edu.au](mailto:uniserveedit@usyd.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 on-line proceedings.

## **4. The review process for papers**

In reviewing the submissions, you are required to rate the submission against the following selection criteria on the Review Form, (Category 1 or 2 identified by the author)

**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 provide global formative comments on the paper for the authors. This is greatly appreciated by both the programme committee and the authors

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. Please note that any paper rejected for a refereed publication will still be considered for presentation at the conference as a non-refereed contribution.

## 5. Rating the papers

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

### 5.1. Originality and Implications for theory, practice and/or policy.

<b>Strong Accept:</b>	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.
<b>Accept:</b>	The paper provides clear implications for practice, policy and /or further research.
<b>Weak Accept</b>	The paper draws basic implications for other practitioners
<b>Neutral or Reject</b>	The paper does not extend beyond the immediate context.

### 5.2. Quality

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

<b>Strong Accept:</b>	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.
<b>Accept:</b>	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.
<b>Weak Accept</b>	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.
<b>Neutral or Reject</b>	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.

### 5.3. Relevance to the Conference and the intended audience

The conference theme is: *Motivation-Ideas and interventions*. Sub-themes are *Research projects for undergraduates; 1<sup>st</sup> Year or Year 13; science and mathematics education research initiatives and related projects*.

The target audience is academics, educators, researchers, students in the field of science and mathematics education.

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

#### 5.4. Presentation.

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

<b>Strong Accept:</b>	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.
<b>Accept:</b>	Most aspects of the written work conform to a high academic standard, i.e., overall, the paper is logical and easy to read.
<b>Weak Accept</b>	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.
<b>Neutral or Reject</b>	This paper is difficult to read and/or the argument or logic is difficult to follow at times.

#### 6. 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.

#### 7. Returning papers and review forms

Please return all papers and review forms as attachments to [uniserveedit@usyd.edu.au](mailto:uniserveedit@usyd.edu.au)