

## Review Process for CJSOTL/RCACEA Articles

The manuscript review process for CJSOTL/RCACEA aims to provide meaningful, developmental feedback for authors that will help them enhance their work, while also assisting the editorial team in making decisions about publication.

The review process is conducted via Berkeley Electronic Press' Editorial Management Software. The process is as follows:

1. One of the editors will screen the submitted manuscript to ensure it meets the basic criteria for scholarship as described in *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (Glassick, Huber, & Maefoff, 1997; i.e., clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique).
2. If the manuscript meets these criteria, the editor will assign the manuscript, with the authors' identifying information removed, to at least two reviewers.
3. The reviewers will evaluate each manuscript according to the general criteria for authentic scholarship addressed above. In particular, reviewers are asked to consider the following questions, which are based on those criteria:
  - Is the manuscript relevant to SoTL, focusing sufficiently on a SoTL question or inquiry?
  - Does the manuscript have clear goals and provide knowledge applicable to the teaching and learning process?
  - Does the manuscript use appropriate research methodology? (if applicable)
  - Does the manuscript give evidence of significant and ethical SoTL research? (if applicable)
  - Are the manuscript's conclusions valid based upon the evidence systematically gathered and upon the argumentation provided?
  - Does the manuscript provide original or new knowledge and advance the scholarship of teaching and learning?
  - Does the manuscript serve to promote national knowledge, conversations, or collaborations about the topic or about SoTL in general?
  - Is the quality of writing adequate?
4. The reviewers will provide, via an online review form, feedback for the manuscript's author(s). This feedback should consider the above questions, and should offer constructive, specific, and detailed comments about what could be enhanced and how. **Please provide thorough, substantive feedback about each question listed in 3 above, as well as specific, additional comments that will help the authors enhance their work.** Rather than tracking changes or adding comments to the manuscript, feedback should be synthesized and entered into the review form. This feedback will be provided to the author(s), with the reviewers' identifying information removed, whether or not the manuscript is ultimately accepted for publication.
5. Each reviewer will give the manuscript a publication recommendation from the following categories:
  - \* Accept submission
  - Accept submission with minor revisions
  - \* Major revisions required for acceptance
  - \* Reject

6. Once the reviews have been completed, the editor will make a decision about publication and the author(s) will be notified.
7. The review process will typically take 8-12 weeks.
8. If a decision of 'major revisions' is reached, reviewers may be asked to re-review a revised submission, again following the process outlined above.