

## EARLI 2017 – REVIEW CRITERIA

Depending on the format and type of research report being submitted, the proposals will be blindly reviewed by at least two reviewers, who are asked to take into account the criteria outlined below according to the type of the contribution. Symposia are evaluated both as a whole and as individual contributions.

Each reviewer is asked to score the quality of each proposal, indicating a score between 1-10 and to provide brief and constructive feedback in the appropriate text box. Scores and comments are both communicated to the authors along with the final decision; we ask our reviewers to be as constructive as possible, while also being considerate of the efforts invested in writing a proposal.

**Please be advised that there are both empirical and theoretical submissions. The review questions containing "OR" will therefore need to be considered with regards to whether the submission is either of an empirical or theoretical nature.**

### EMPIRICAL PAPER

- Relevance to EARLI domain of Learning and Instruction
- Significance for theory, policy and practice
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Research method and design for both qualitative and quantitative approaches (research questions, context, participants, data sources, sampling, procedure, ethical issues)
- Clarity of results or preliminary results and conclusions
- Overall quality and scientific originality

## THEORETICAL PAPER

- Relevance to EARLI domain of Learning and Instruction
- Significance for theoretical debate
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Embeddedness in relevant literature
- Clarity and robustness of theoretical argument
- Overall quality and scientific originality

## POSTER (EMPIRICAL)

- Relevance to EARLI domain of Learning and Instruction
- Significance for theory, policy and practice
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Research method and design (research questions, context, participants, data sources, sampling, procedure, ethical issues)
- Preliminary data analysis or Anticipated results
- Overall quality and scientific originality

## POSTER (THEORETICAL)

- Relevance to EARLI domain of Learning and Instruction
- Significance for theoretical debate
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Embeddedness in relevant literature
- Clarity and robustness of theoretical argument
- Overall quality and scientific originality

## SYMPOSIUM AS A WHOLE

- Relevance to EARLI domain of Learning and Instruction
- Significance for theory, practice and policy
- Theoretical perspective, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Organisation and internal logic of the whole symposium
- Overall quality and scientific originality

*Each paper in a symposium will also be reviewed as an individual paper using the criteria outlined above.*

## ROUND TABLE

- Relevance to EARLI domain of Learning and Instruction
- Significance for theory, policy and practice
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Research method and design (research questions, context, participants, data sources, sampling, procedure, ethical issues)
- Clarity of issue at stake
- Overall quality and scientific originality

## ICT DEMONSTRATION

- Relevance to EARLI domain of Learning and Instruction
- Significance for theory, policy and practice
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Validation in domain of application (as research method, data collection, research procedure, etc.)
- Quality of workshop format (activity based) or demonstration activities
- Overall quality and scientific originality

## WORKSHOP

- Relevance to EARLI domain of Learning and Instruction
- Significance for theory, policy and practice
- Theoretical framework, conceptual rationale or pragmatic grounding
- Validation in domain of application (as research method, data collecting, research procedure, etc.)
- Quality of workshop format (activity based) or demonstration activities
- Overall quality and scientific originality



## REVIEW THRESHOLDS

The International Programme Committee (IPC) has set the following thresholds for accepting a proposal at the EARLI 2017 conference:

Score	Review Decision
<b>Less than 35</b>	Automatic rejection for all contributions, including symposia.
<b>Over 70</b>	Automatic acceptance.
<b>Between 36-69</b>	Acceptance or rejection will be decided by the International Scientific Committee. Please note that the International Scientific Committee will not perform reviews but will make a decision based on, and respecting, the reviewers' suggestions and comments.

Whenever there is a discrepancy of 25 % between two review scores for those proposals between 36 % - 69 %, the proposal is automatically sent to a third reviewer. The reviewer's scores are averaged and taken into account when deciding if a proposal is accepted or not.

Symposia that scored an overall score below 70 % will be split into papers to which the acceptance criteria for single papers apply.

Papers that have scored between 59 % - 50 % will be accepted as a poster presentation.

Please note that all scores refer to "combined review scores" (average of review scores).

When a symposium is rejected, the individual papers comprising the symposium are evaluated on their own merit. Individual papers that are accepted based on the received scores are likely to be scheduled in the same paper session.

Authors whose reviews are complete and within the automatic rejection or acceptance range will receive an automatic notification. In order to announce all results simultaneously, the announcing of review results will happen after all review results have been collected. This means that authors will be notified by the end of February 2017.