

# Information for Reviewers

## 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.

## 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.

*Next deadline: 5 days 8 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.*

#### [Program Committee Online Forum](#)

You may now discuss online about all papers and reviews to complete the conference program.

*Time left: 83 days 7 hours*

If you click [Edit Reviews](#), you see the list of contributions assigned to you.

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.

## 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

<b>107</b>	10. Teacher Education Research <i>Format of Presentation:</i> Symposium <b>YXxxd Uddd</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <a href="#">Show Proposal Abstract</a></li> <li>▶ <a href="#">Contribution Details</a></li> <li>▶ <a href="#">Enter Review</a></li> </ul>
Time left to submit the review: 1807 days 9 hours		

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.

<b>107</b>	4. Inclusive Education <i>Format of Presentation:</i> Symposium <b>YXxxd Uddd</b> Wegscheider, Angelika <i>Organization(s):</i> EERA Office Berlin, Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <a href="#">Show Proposal Abstract</a></li> <li>▶ <a href="#">Contribution Details</a></li> <li>▶ <a href="#">Show Review</a></li> <li>▶ <a href="#">Edit Review</a></li> </ul>
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](#).

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

### 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:

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

Networks using long version:

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	The proposal has a coherent argumentation and an appropriate methodology.
	<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.
	<input type="text"/>

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	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.
	<input type="text"/>

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 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	<a href="#">D er conflict test</a> 📄 21. Postgraduate Network (Pre-Conference) · Paper	<b>Wegscheider, Angelika; Schwämmlein, daniela</b> EERA Office Berlin, Germany	<b>1 message</b> (1 by you) <a href="#">Create Message</a>	<b>On Hold</b> - 📄 +
---	---	-----	--	---	--	-------------------------

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.