

## 1. General Reviewing Guidelines

### Information for ECER Reviewers

#### 1. *Criteria*

EERA would like to draw your attention to the general reviewing criteria, which should guide you in reviewing the abstracts submitted for the conference:

- The proposal should be directly related to a topic of interest for educational research and should fit well into the selected network;
- It should be coherent in argumentation and methodology and should put forward a clear research question or focus of enquiry.
- It should involve systematic enquiry of an empirical or analytic nature and needs to set out the applied methods clearly.
- It should make reference to a theoretical framework and show awareness of previous work and own contributions;
- The proposal should be set out clearly in a manner which is accessible to an international audience and it should take account of the European and/or international context
- It should help to develop a European dialogue by reference, for instance, to current European policies or intellectual and educational traditions; and
- Symposium submissions and roundtables need to include at least 3 different countries or national perspectives.

#### 2. *Conftool Technique*

General: When rating proposals in Conftool, reviewers leave both a) comments to the authors and b) a recommendation to the Link Convenor/ Programme Committee on whether or not to accept a submission. This is done by a) leaving written feedback for authors, b) completing a reviewing grid which rates the proposal on a scale of 10 and by c) leaving an overall suggestion for the Link Convenor. As a reviewer/ member of the programme committee you will have access to papers assigned to you after clicking "Edit Reviews"

**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*

You will then find a list of all submissions (listed per submission number) which are assigned to you plus some filter options (see below).

For reading offline, you can either export all abstracts as DOC or print them.

If you are reviewing for more than one network (e.g. for the Emerging Researchers Group + one other network) a filter will help you to keep the overview on which papers you are currently working.

We suggest that for reading submissions online you use the option **Show Proposal Abstract**. It is easier to browse through than **Contribution Details** and it 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 side, under the number of the submission, you have not yet entered a review.

When the field is olive green, you have only saved a draft (**Save as Draft**) and you will need to go back into the review form and click **Submit Review**.

When the field is green, you have already saved a review. By clicking **Edit Review** but you can still edit it.

### R 3. Review Form

The reviewing form will ask you

- to rate the submission against a set of criteria
- to leave comments for authors
- to put forward an overall recommendation for the Programme Committee (Accept/reject/redirect a submission)
- to leave further comments for the Programme Committee

### **Suggest a proposal for redirection**

**Redirections:** Redirection is indicated when the paper does not fit thematically into the network but is nonetheless a promising paper (redirection is not a “soft” form of rejection). Your overall suggestion is intended to give the link convenor enough information to make an informed final decision on the paper’s status. Therefore, please explain in the section “Internal comments” why you feel the paper does not fit into the selected network’s focus.

### **Rating the proposal via a scale**

Reviewers will be asked to state how strongly they agree or disagree with the given statements. Authors usually receive a list displaying the ratings for each statement (this is, of course, completely anonymous) when they are informed about the reviewing outcome. Some networks decided to send the written feedback only.

Please note: There are two different review forms, the short form with 3 statements and the longer form with 6 statements. The Link Convenor of your network decided on which form to use for evaluation. If you are reviewing for 2 different networks, keep in mind that the forms might be different.

### **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

### **Leaving Comments for the author**

As some networks decided to only send out the written feedback left by reviewers and not the gradings, we would ask you to **always** fill in the field **Comments for the authors**. This is especially important for somewhat weaker proposals.

Receiving these comments as guidelines will give them additional feedback and the opportunity to improve future proposals. Please provide a detailed explanation for your evaluation. 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

<https://eera-ecer.de/ecer-2019-hamburg/submission/review-criteria/>

### **Overall Suggestion and Leaving Comments for the Programme Committee**

Link Convenors use the overview of the reviewing outcomes (i.e. an average calculated for each proposal) as an initial guide for acceptance or rejection, however they also rely heavily on the reviewers’ comments/additional guidance left for the programme committee. At the end of the reviewing grid, you are asked for an Overall Suggestion as to whether a submission should be accepted, rejected or redirected (**accept, reject, redirect**).

In addition to the “overall suggestion”, you are also asked to leave some written comments for the programme committee. This box is called **Internal comments**. **IF YOU HAVE SUGGESTED THE PROPOSAL BE REDIRECTED, please be sure to explain why you feel it does not fit into the selected networks' focus.**

The Overall Suggestion and internal comments will not be passed on to the author(s) but is substantial information for the Link Convenor.

**Information for the programme committee**

Overall Suggestion (for the programme committee only)

Accept

Reject

Redirect

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 or IF YOU HAVE SUGGESTED THE PROPOSAL BE REDIRECTED, please explain why you feel it does not fit into the selected network's focus.

### **Finalising your review**

When you have finished your review, please click [Submit Review](#). 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 section 2).

### ***Reviewing Phases***

Please note that there will be two phases of reviewing:

- (1) The first round, after which the Link Convenor decides on [acceptance](#), [rejection](#) or [redirection \(to another network\)](#) according to your review results by setting the submission status to [accept](#), [reject](#) or [redirect](#).
- (2) 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 set the submission status to [accepted](#) or [rejected](#).