

## Reviewing Process for EJOLTS

First, thanks you for agreeing to be a reviewer for EJOLTS. We are hoping this will be the beginning of a long and fruitful collaboration and that we will all benefit from the experience of learning together.

Like everything else in EJOLTS at the moment, the reviewing process is at a formative stage of development and therefore we are not attempting to be too prescriptive about what is and is not acceptable for a review. However, here are a few pointers that may help you.

The main aim of a review for EJOLTS should be that it *illuminates* the submission in ways which make it more comprehensible and to readers. With this in mind, there are three issues to consider when reviewing:

- a) Does the submission account for influences the author has developed in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of social formations?
- b) The submissions should reveal a desire to bring (at least some of) the values of, for example, love, freedom, justice, compassion, courage, care and democratic evaluation more fully into the world.
- c) In what ways might your own experiences and insights be brought to bear in order to enhance the submission in some way?

Rather than a review being perceived as a static process, we are hoping it will engage you and the authors (and anyone who is interested) in dynamic discussions about how we might, together, improve what we are doing.

The team at EJOLTS (see <http://ejolts.net/drupal/editorial>) would like to offer a creative and dialectical space within which we all feel comfortable to challenge and/or affirm in an atmosphere of mutual learning.

You will then need to append one of the following statements to your comments:

- 1) **ACCEPT** - Publish as it stands;
- 2) **ACCEPT with modification** - But needs further work as indicated in the review;
- 3) **RESUBMIT**: The author could resubmit after undertaking the following work but with no guarantee of acceptance;
- 4) **RESUBMIT, WITH SUPPORT**: The author will be offered reviewer's support if they wish to revise the paper;
- 5) **REJECT**: For reasons indicated

After the author(s) has received your review s/he will have some time to reconsider in the light of your insights and then take the appropriate action.

By the way, we would welcome any feedback about the process of review that might help us to improve what we are doing in our journal.

Moira Laidlaw, August, 2008.