

Guidelines for using the reviewing module in Conftool

The following guidelines will help you to process reviewing via the Conference Management System. If there are questions or if you feel unsure about certain procedures, please do not hesitate to contact the EERA Office.

1. Check registered co-convenors and reviewers

Wording

On the EERA Website, we publish the Link Convenor(s) and Co-Convenors of each network. Additionally, each network can appoint Reviewers for ECER. In the Conftool system, Co-Convenors and Reviewers will be summarised under the umbrella-term Programme Committee (PC).

To check who is registered as a PC Member of your network, please log in to the Conftool system <https://www.conftool.com/ecer2012> where you will get to the **Overview** with the following list of options:

You can select from the following options:

- Show User Account Details**
Here you may access the personal data of your user account.
- Edit User Account Details**
Here you can update your personal user data.
- Your Submissions**
Here you can submit contributions and manage your submitted contributions.
Next deadline: 54 days 13 hours
- Logout**
Please sign out when you are finished to prevent unauthorised access to your account.
- Logout and Return to the Main Website**
Sign out and return to the website "ECER 2009 Vienna - European Conference on Educational Research".

You are reviewer or member of the program committee (PC member). You have currently the following options:

- Edit Reviews**
Here you can access the contributions assigned to you and enter your reviews.
0 contributions were assigned to you. You did already enter 0 reviews.

As chair of the program committee, you have access to all contributions and reviews:

Assigned to the following network(s):

- 21. Postgraduate Network (Pre-Conference)

- Manage Submissions and Reviews**
Access to submitted contributions, all program committee (PC) members and their reviews.
Quick Links: [Submissions](#), [Program Committee](#), [Review Results](#), [Finals](#), [Sessions](#).
- Bulk E-mails**
This part of the program lets you send e-mails to people stored in ConfTool.

In **Manage Submissions and Reviews**, you can find **Programme Committee** within the **Quick links**. By clicking on it, you will see a list with all the persons already registered as Programme Committee members of your network. If a colleague is missing or a wrong person is on the list, please inform the EERA Office at preis@eera.eu.

2. Assign reviews

In the list of the **Programme Committee** you can click on **Assign Reviews** in the line of every reviewer.

199	Schwämmlein, Daniela Administrative Assistant schwaemlein@eera.eu (schwaemlein)	EERA Office Berlin DE, Germany	Chair (29) PC(1) Reviews 1 / 1	Presenter Author	0 Topics Assign Reviews
------------	---	-----------------------------------	---	----------------------------	--

Then you see a list of all the contributions for your network and you can assign contributions to the reviewer by clicking **Assign** and then **Safe Data**. The reviewer will only be able to see the contributions you assigned him to.

It also works the other way round. You can also click **Submissions** on the **Quick links** list (see above).

ID	Title of Proposal	Author(s)	Reviews	Actions
	EERA Network · Uploaded	Submitting Author		
172	fga 21. Postgraduate Network (Pre-Conference) - Symposium	Schwämmlein, Daniela; Wegscheider, Angelika Schwämmlein, Daniela	Reviewers: 1 Reviews: 1 Accepted	Assign Edit Withdraw

Then you get to a list with all the contributions and you can assign a reviewer to each contribution.

In case the reviewer is author or co-author of a contribution, the system will warn you about a conflict, see below.

Member of the Program Committee (PC member) Wegscheider, Angelika Organization / Company: EERA Office Berlin, DE Priority Topics: -- E-mail: eera@zedat.fu-berlin.de	conflict (Author) Assigned submissions for reviewing: 2	Assign <input type="checkbox"/> Set Conflict <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	---	---

Should you find “dummy submissions” which were just placed for testing purposes (like the one above, entitled fga) or double entries, please let us know the ID numbers and we will delete them.

3. Reviewing Process

3.1 Information for Reviewers

All reviewers have access via their Conftool user accounts to the following reviewing guidelines and technical advice for ECER 2012.

R 1. Criteria

EERA would like to draw your attention to the general reviewing criteria, which should act as a guide to help you when reviewing the abstracts submitted for the conference:

- The proposal should be directly related to a topic of interest for educational research;
- it should involve systematic enquiry of an empirical or analytic nature and should make reference to a theoretical framework;
- the background, method, results and implications should be set out clearly in a manner which is accessible to an international audience;
- it should take account of the European and/or international context;
- it should help a European dialogue to develop by reference, for example, to current European policies or intellectual and educational traditions; and
- Symposium submissions and roundtables need to include 3 different countries/national perspectives.

The actual reviewing form will address all these criteria, albeit in a different format.

R 2. Conftool Technique

Please note that there will be two phases of reviewing: The first round, after which the Link Convenor decides on **Acceptance**, **Rejection** or **Redirection** according to your review results and the second round, where only the redirected contributions are reviewed by the reviewers of the alternative network. At the end of the second phase, redirection will no longer be possible and Link Convenors will only be able to either accept or reject a submission.

Once your chair has assigned contributions to you, you will be able to access them via **Edit Reviews** on the **Overview** list, when logged in to Conftool, see below.

You can select from the following options:

Edit User Account Details Here you can update your personal user data.
Your Submissions Here you can submit contributions and manage your submitted contributions. <i>Next deadline: 5 days 8 hours</i>
Logout Please sign out when you are finished to prevent unauthorised access to your account.
Logout and Return to the Main Website Sign out and return to the website "ECER 2009 Vienna - European Conference on Educational Research".

You are reviewer or member of the program committee (PC member). You have currently the following options:

Edit Reviews Here you can access the contributions assigned to you and enter your reviews. <i>0 contributions were assigned to you. You did already enter 0 reviews.</i>
Program Committee Online Forum You may now discuss online about all papers and reviews to complete the conference program. <i>Time left: 83 days 7 hours</i>

If you click **Edit Reviews**, you see the list of contributions assigned to you.

Enter and Edit Reviews

Now you may access the conference contributions assigned to you for reviewing. Please enter your results before the end of the reviewing phase. During this phase it is also possible to edit and print your entries.

Survey of Your Reviews

107	10. Teacher Education Research <i>Format of Presentation: Symposium</i> YXxxd Uddd	▶ Show Proposal Abstract ▶ Contribution Details ▶ Enter Review
	Time left to submit the review: 1807 days 9 hours	

We suggest that you use the option **Show Proposal Abstract** for reading the contribution, as it is clearer than **Contribution Details** and contains more information.

You can access the review form by clicking **Enter Review** in the above list. When there is a red field on the left of the line, under the number of the submission, you have not yet entered a review. When the field is green, you have already saved a review but can still edit it.

107	4. Inclusive Education <i>Format of Presentation: Symposium</i> YXxxd Uddd Wegscheider, Angelika <i>Organization(s): EERA Office Berlin, Germany</i>	▶ Show Proposal Abstract ▶ Contribution Details ▶ Show Review ▶ Edit Review
	We have received your review. Thank you very much. Time left to update the review: 1797 days 10 hours	

When the field is olive green, you have only saved a draft and need to go back into the review form and click **Safe Review**.

20076	06. Open Learning: Media, Environments and Cultures <i>Format of Presentation:</i> Round Table this is a TEST Brandis, Monica (1); duck, daisy (2) <i>Organisation(s):</i> 1: EERA office, Germany; 2: eera belgium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Show Proposal Abstract ▶ Contribution Details ▶ Show Draft of Review ▶ Enter Review
	<p>You have saved a draft; no review was submitted yet.</p> <p>Time left to submit the review: 1443 days 7 hours</p>	

R 3. Review Form

There are two different review forms, one short with 3 statements and one longer with 6 statements. The Link Convenor of your network decided on which form to use for evaluation.

Networks using short version:

Networks using long version:

- NW 3
- NW 4
- NW 6
- NW 7
- NW 8
- NW 11
- NW 12
- NW 13
- NW 14
- NW 17
- NW 18
- NW 19
- NW 20
- NW 22
- NW 25
- NW 26
- NW 28

- NW 1
- NW 2
- NW 5
- NW 9
- NW 10
- NW 15
- NW 16
- NW 21
- NW 23
- NW 24
- NW 27

Rating the proposal via a scale

Reviewers will be asked to state how strongly they agree or disagree to the given statements.

The authors will normally get a list with the points received for each statement from each reviewer (anonymously) when they are informed about the reviewing outcome. However networks may decide to only send the written feedback.

Example statement and rating scale

* Coherence in Argumentation and Methodology	<p>The proposal has a coherent argumentation and an appropriate methodology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 10 - I completely agree <input checked="" type="radio"/> 08 - I agree <input type="radio"/> 06 - I partly agree <input type="radio"/> 04 - I partly disagree <input type="radio"/> 02 - I disagree <input type="radio"/> 00 - I completely disagree
--	---

Link Convenors might use the overview of the reviewing outcomes (i.e. an average calculated for each proposal) as a first guidance for acceptance or rejection. But they also rely heavily on reviewers

leaving comments for the Programme Committee. In order to support the Link Convenors in their decisions, please leave further comments in the section dedicated to this within the reviewing grid!

Suggest a proposal for redirection

You have the possibility to select “Redirect Paper”. This is the first question within the reviewing grid. You can select that the **Proposal fits well into the chosen network** or that **This submission should be redirected to the following alternative network**: The system automatically shows the alternative network selected by the author, you cannot influence that. If the reviewers of the alternative network find the contribution inappropriate for their network either, the contribution will be rejected. **So please use the option Redirect carefully.**

Recommendation	
	Please decide if this submission is suitable for your network or should be redirected to the alternative network stated by the author.
* Redirect Paper	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Proposal fits well into the chosen network. <input type="radio"/> This submission should be redirected to the following alternative network: 1. Continuing Professional Development for Teachers and Leaders in Schools

For technical reasons you need to fill in the full reviewing grid when suggesting a submission for redirection. This is counter-intuitive, as you might feel hesitating to rate a submission which is not within your network/field of research. Therefore it is suggested **that you assign “0” – I disagree strongly** to all items in the reviewing form. **Combined with** the suggestion to **redirect** a submission, Link Convenors will understand this as a signal that you did not grade the proposal.

At the **Overall Suggestion** (for the programme committee only), you can either click **Accept**, **Reject** or **Redirect**. But if you have already suggested Redirection for this submission in the first question, any setting you take here will automatically be altered into **Redirect** when saving the review. Should you have changed your mind, please go back to the first question and change your selection there. Then you can either select **Accept** or **Reject** as overall recommendation for the submission.

If a proposal is redirected to the second choice network, all past reviews will be deleted.

Leaving Comments for the author

Although the grading already gives an overview of your evaluation of the proposal, we would ask you to **always** fill in the field **Comments for the authors**. This is especially important for somehow weaker proposals as authors of rejected submissions will be advised to re-submit in next year’s ECER based on the comments they received from reviewers.

Comments on the submission	
* Comments for the authors	Please explain your evaluation in a detailed and clear manner. Point out strengths and weaknesses of the submitted contribution. Please also provide suggestions for improvement and use an objective and constructive writing style. <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div>

Receiving these comments as guidelines will give them even more feedback and the opportunity to improve future proposals. Please provide an explanation for your evaluation, as detailed as possible,

which allows the authors to understand it. Point out strengths and weaknesses of the submitted contribution. Please also provide suggestions for improvement and use an objective and constructive writing style. See examples for helpful review comments at <http://www.eera-ecer.eu/ecer/ecer2011/submission2011/review-criteria/>

Leaving comments for the programme committee

The final section in the reviewing grid is **Information for the programme committee**. All information given here will only be accessible to the members of the Programme Committee, not to the authors. You are asked for an **Overall Suggestion** whether to accept, reject or redirect a submission. The author will not be informed about your choice here.

Information for the programme committee	
Overall Suggestion (for the programme committee only)	<input type="radio"/> Accept <input type="radio"/> Reject <input checked="" type="radio"/> Redirect to other ECER network
Internal comments	<p>These comments are only for programme committee (PC) members and will not be passed on to authors. Please use this box to give some advice to link convenors on the status of the proposal. E.g. if the proposal is weak, can it nevertheless be suggested for acceptance in order to foster professional development of the presenter.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div>

You also have a text box for information that is directed to the members of the programme committee of your network, **Internal comments**. These comments will not be passed on to authors. Please use this box to give additional advice to Link Convenors on the status of the proposal, e.g. if the proposal is weak, can it nevertheless be suggested for acceptance in order to foster professional development of the presenter.

Finalising your review

When you have finished your review, please click **Submit Review**, below right. Your comments and results will then be listed automatically in the Link Convenor's section **Review Results**. He or she will formally assign the final status to the contribution. If you click **Save as Draft**, the Link Convenor does not yet have access to your review; and in your **Edit Review** list, it will be marked with an olive background for making clear that the final review (marked in green) has not yet been saved, see R 2.

R 4. Forum

When you click **Programme Committee Online Forum** on the Overview list, you can see all the contributions for your network, apart from those where you are author or co-author, of course. And when you click on the title of a contribution, you can see comments left by your colleagues.

-	0	406	Der conflict test 21. Postgraduate Network (Pre-Conference) · Paper	Wegscheider, Angelika; Schwämmlein, daniela EERA Office Berlin, Germany	1 message (1 by you) Create Message	On Hold - +
---	---	-----	---	---	--	------------------------

You also have the possibility to write a message (**Create Message**, see image above) that can be read by the other reviewers of your network if they visit the forum. If there is a message, you can click on **1 message** and read it.

The forum can be used for discussion between the reviewers, but only until the final acceptance status has been set by the Link Convenor.

3.3 Information for Link Convenors

Reviewers are asked to assess contributions by

- attributing points on a scale
- by leaving comments to authors and Link Convenors
- by leaving an overall suggestion for the Link Convenor whether to accept, redirect or reject a proposal.

Link Convenors can ground their final decisions (the final status they give to submissions) on either the average points a submission receives, on the comments colleagues leave or on the overall recommendation. Many will use a mixture of these.

In the following you'll find a description on how to best work with these options.

- First you will read about how to decipher the colours and average numbers,
- later you will be introduced to how to work with the **Overall Suggestion**.
- The third step will show you how to assign the final **Acceptance Status**.

As a Link Convenor/Network Chair you can access all reviewing comments of the reviewers within your network.

When you click **Review Results** in the **Quick Links** list, you will find a list with all the submissions for your network and their results:

Rank	Points	Reviews Span	ID	Contribution Title	Author(s) Submitting Author	Acceptance Status	Session Forum
1	10.0	1 / 2 0.0	112	Practice proposal 21. Postgraduate Network (Pre-Conference) · Paper	Beddow, Rachel Beddow, Rachel	Accepted	0 messages
2	0.0	0 / 0 -	116	Globalization Phenomena and its Effects on Educational Concepts 21. Postgraduate Network (Pre-Conference) · Paper	Schröttner, Barbara Schröttner, Barbara	On Hold	- 0 messages
3	0.0	0 / 0 -	117	Subjective Dimension and Culture-Centred Attitude in Ethnographic Research 21. Postgraduate Network (Pre-Conference) · Paper	Schröttner, Barbara Schröttner, Barbara	On Hold	- 0 messages
4	0.0	0 / 0 -	110	The cognitive effects of positive affect on creative thinking 🗨️ 21. Postgraduate Network (Pre-Conference) · Paper	Yeh, Shu-Hua Yeh, Shu-Hua	On Hold	- 0 messages

Points is the average of the points received; **Reviews/Span** you have two lines, the 1/2 shows how many of the reviewers assigned have already saved a review, and the number underneath shows the span between the lowest and the highest points the submission received; if the span is vast, the submission might be re-discussed by the reviewers or the programme committee.

The **Acceptance Status** will be **On hold** first and has to be changed by you when a final decision about a submission has been taken. In **Session Forum** (see more details above) you can see the number of comments made by reviewers and you can read them by clicking on **X Messages**.

You can read the different review comments when clicking on the title of the contribution in the above list. The review results and comments are on the bottom of this Contribution Details page.

3.3.1 Review Results are indicated by colours, points and a Review Span.

Link Convenors will find the submissions ranked by the average scores given by the reviewers. This average score can and should only serve to get a first overview on reviewers' views of the proposal. By clicking on the title of the submission, Link Convenors will get access to the detailed reviewing comments which the reviewers have left for authors and Link Convenors.

In the first round of reviewing, Link Convenors will be able either to accept, reject or redirect a submission. All redirections will be reviewed in the second round of reviewing. The Link Convenors will then only be able to choose between accept and reject in the second round of reviewing.

How to read the colours and signals in the Review Results list

Green

Green colour and numbers higher than 5 suggest there was positive response to the proposal. Please also note the **Review Span** as it will show you how much reviewers differed in their views. Small spans and green colours indicate that all reviewers gave a high average of points for each statement.

16	8.0	2 / 2 -	1645	Student He Roles of Pr Staff · Paper
17	7.3	2 / 2 1.3	1098	Violence in psychologi and lessor · Paper

Yellow

Yellow indicates that the average of points is around 5, plus minus one.

29	5.0	2 / 2 2.1	686	Disc educ · Pap
30	5.0 !	2 / 2 0.7	2107	Kids · Pap

Orange and Red

Orange and Red shows you that the average of all points of all reviewers is below 4.

85	3.3	2 / 2 2.7	203	Social · Paper
86	1.3	2 / 2 2.6	547	Metac resear profes · Paper

More Details – Reading the Overall Suggestion and Comments for Link Convenors

Should you wish to see the exact points per statement and/or the Overall Suggestion given by each reviewer, you have to click on the title of the proposal in the **Review Results** list. You will get to the Contribution Details which also show all Reviewers' comments on the contribution, including the points given, the comments for the author, the internal comments and the Overall Suggestion.

Red point with exclamation mark

An exclamation mark indicates that at least one reviewer selected **Redirect**. The average displayed in combination with **Redirect** is misleading, as reviewers were invited to assign "0" to all questions if they suggested to redirect a proposal. So please always check the review comments when you see the red point with the exclamation mark!

83	4.4 !	2 / 2 2.0	1476	Search Valenc Pedag · Paper
84	4.3 !!	2 / 2 0.6	1458	Studer Influer · Paper

N.B. all reviews will be deleted when a submission is redirected to the second choice network.

Working with Overall Suggestion in the Review Results List

Some networks rather take a look into how many reviewers suggested **Accept/ Reject/ Redirect** as an overall suggestion, than looking at average reviewing results when selecting the final status for the submissions.

If you are interested in the Overall Suggestion:

Click [Review Results](#), then [Show more filter options](#) / and in the last filter [Overall Suggestion](#), you can select [Accept](#), [Redirect](#) or [Reject](#).

The display below will now change. The average Points disappear and the column [Review/Span](#) now entails different information. "Normally" a 2/3 in this column would tell you that 2 out of 3 reviewers have already reviewed the proposal.

If the Special Filter [Overall Suggestion](#) is on [Accept](#), a 2/3 in this column will tell you that 2 out of 3 reviewers chose [Accept](#) as overall suggestion.

In the above example, this means that for line 1, 6 of 6 reviewers suggested [Accept](#), in line 2, 5 of 6 and in line 3 only one of the 6 selected [Accept](#) as overall suggestion. By clicking on the title of the proposal, you will be able to see all reviews, as usual.

	Points	Reviews Span	ID	Contribution Title EERA Network
1	--	6 / 6 1.4	293	The proper study Paper
2	--	5 / 6 1.4	1793	Twilight Of The Ci Symposium
3	--	1 / 6	629	The Role of Teach Process: A Study Educational Philos

3.3.2 Final Results

After the first round of reviewing, the Link Convenor decides on Acceptance, Rejection or Redirection according to the review results. In the second round, redirected papers will be reviewed.

Link Convenors will need to attribute the final status to the contribution. Please use the drop down box called [Acceptance Status](#) for doing so. As a standard it is set to [On Hold](#).

After the first phase of reviewing you can set it to

- [Accepted](#)
- [On Hold](#) (you can leave it on hold if you haven't made a decision yet)
- [Rejected](#)
- [Redirect](#) (only available during the first round of reviewing)

3.3.3 How to redirect a proposal

If reviewers have suggested a submission for redirection, this is indicated by a red dot with an exclamation mark. If you as Link Convenor then decide to redirect a contribution, please set the acceptance status to [Redirect](#) in the dropdown box.

The contribution will not be redirected automatically. The office will redirect submissions which are labelled as [Redirect](#) when the first round of reviewing is over. When the office has done so, these submissions will disappear from your list and will be listed within the alternative network. All reviews given within the first network will be deleted before a submission is redirected.

When deciding whether to redirect a submission in the first round of reviewing, keep in mind that the average of received points displayed in combination with [Redirect](#) is misleading. Reviewers were invited to assign "0" to all questions if they suggested to redirect a proposal. So please always check the review comments when you see the red point with the exclamation mark!

If submissions have been redirected to your network for the second round of reviewing, you can recognize them easily as their status is **RED_Incoming**. If you wish, you can also filter all your submissions and only have the redirected visible if you select **RED Incoming** in the Acceptance Status Filter.

>>> [Show Filter Options](#)

Network / Type of submission		All Networks / types of submissions				
Acceptance Status		Any contribution status				
<input type="text"/> <input type="button" value="Search"/>		1 2 3 ... 53 · Next ==>				
1057 entries on the list.		Per Page: 20				
Page 1 of 53						
Points	Reviews Span	ID	Contribution Title	Author(s) Submitting Author	Acceptance Status	Session Forum

Please note that redirections go directly to the alternative network selected by the author. If the reviewers of the alternative network find the contribution inappropriate for their network too, the contribution will be rejected. So please use the option **Redirect** carefully.

4. Sending Bulk Emails and communication with authors

The conference management system allows the Link Convenors to send **Bulk Mails** to special user groups within the conference management system. You will find this option at the very bottom of the **Overview** list.

Please click **Bulk Mails**, then you can either select **Send Emails to a Group of Users** or **Send Emails to Authors**.

We would ask you to only write to your Programme Committee and not to the authors, as all the important information, like acceptance status, time of presentation etc will be sent to the authors by the office.

Selection of recipients	
Only Users with Status	Please select group of persons...
Network / Type of submission	21. Postgraduate Network (Pre-Conference)
Network / Type selection applies only for e-mails to chairs, pc members and reviewers.	
Message Entry	
Sender's Name	ECER 2009 Organizers
Sender's E-mail Address	info@ecer2009.eu
E-mail Address for Replies	
Subject Field	ECER 2009
Message Body	
Mail Format	Plain Text Format <input type="button" value="Switch to HTML editor"/>
Please note: Plain text e-mails are small and work with every mail program. HTML e-mails allow text styles, but can cause problems with some mail programs.	
Message	{dear_fullname},

If you want to contact your Programme Committee/Reviewers, click **Send Emails to a Group of Users** and then you can select them in the scroll down field **Only Users with Status**.

Before entering your message, please have a look at the fields for the Sender's Email Address and Email Address for Replies. **Do not change** the Sender's Email Address, as you will not be able to send Emails from a different Email address. But please fill in your own email address as the [Email Address for Replies](#), so all the answers to your email will directly be sent to you.

You will see that there is already some information in the [Message](#) field, like a footer and a header, *{dear_fullname}*. Do not change this as the database will replace this expression with title and name of the respective recipient.

If you want to communicate with a single author directly, you can click on his or her name in the [List of Contributions](#) or in the [Review Results](#) list and you are linked to the corresponding address page where you can find the email address.