**Reviewer Instructions and Feedback Form for *The Advocate***

While the editor screens submissions for suitability, if you have concerns about the submission’s relevance, please email Gary Andersen, Co-Editor, [ggandersen@fhsu.edu](mailto:ggandersen@fhsu.edu) or Laurie Curtis, Co-Editor, [ljcurtis@ksu.edu](mailto:ljcurtis@ksu.edu) .

1. **Please read the manuscript in its entirety** to understand its context within the discipline, rigor, contributions, and importance.
2. **Decide which rubric** will be used in the evaluation depending on the type of submission
3. ***Research articles*** (normally 1,500-5000 words). These articles will typically report a completed investigation or offer a critical review of a number of investigations that share a common theme or topic relevant to teacher preparation. These articles should contain descriptions of the issue or problem under study, a review of relevant literature, methodology, data and implications of the results.
4. ***Reflective article***(about 500 - 1500 words). These might describe work in progress, raise issues arising from such work, or discuss general issues related to methodologies, ethics, government policy, collaboration, etc. in educator preparation. These articles need to ~~be~~ have a clear purpose statement connecting it to the Focus and Scope of The Advocate and conclusion. Writing should be supported by connections to the relevant research literature base.
5. ***Book / Article Review or Critique*** (about 750-1500 words). These will review or critique books or articles relevant to teacher preparation, teacher recruitment and retention and typically provide a sense of the main arguments and presentation style of the author, clarifying connections to any specific audience or element of the profession of educator preparation.
6. **Next, evaluate the manuscript using the criteria in the appropriately selected reviewer feedback form** (see p. 2-4 and select the appropriate form). When logging in to submit your review, please attach this file as part of your Report or with the confidential Cover Letter.

Use your comments to the author as an opportunity to seek explanation on any unclear points and for further elaboration.

* Please make suggestions as to how the author can improve clarity, succinctness, and the overall quality of presentation of the manuscript.
* It is not the job of the reviewer to edit the paper for technical writing and mechanics (such as grammar, spelling, punctuation, and syntax), but it is helpful if you correct language where the technical meaning is or may be unclear. If you do notice a few errors, making note of them is greatly appreciated by authors and the editorial board. As an open-access journal, we do not have editing services available.
* Reviewers may disagree with author(s’) opinions, but should allow them to stand, provided the author’s opinions are consistent with the evidence provided.
* Remember, authors will welcome positive feedback as well as constructive criticism from you as a reviewer.
* Being critical whilst remaining sensitive to the author isn’t always easy and comments should be carefully constructed so that the author fully understands what actions they need to take to improve their paper. For example, generalized or vague statements should be avoided along with any negative comments which aren’t relevant or constructive.

**ATE-K The Advocate: Reviewer Rubric for Research Article**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewer Name | |  | | | | |
| Manuscript Name  Or # | |  | | | | |
| **#1** Rate the manuscript on each of the criteria listed below. Proposals that do not address specific criteria should be marked “not present” for that element and given a score of 0 for that category. | | | | | | |
| Criteria | Not Present = 0 | | Low = 1 | Developing = 2 | Basic = 3 | High = 4 |
| Quality of Objectives |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Lit Review/ Theory |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Methods |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Data Analysis |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Implications |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Score Section 1** | | |  | | |  |
| **#2** Rate the manuscript on the criteria listed below | | | | | | |
| Criteria | Not Present = 0 | | Low = 1 | Developing = 2 | Basic = 3 | High = 4 |
| Importance of Issue |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution of Study to Field |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Writing |  | |  |  |  |  |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Total Score Section 2** |  |  | | | | | | | |
| ***Comments (these comments may or may not be shared with the author):***  What do you feel are the strengths of the paper?  What do you feel the author can do to improve the paper? (please be as specific as possible)  Additional thoughts/ comments regarding this submission: | | | | | | |

**ATE-K The Advocate: Reviewer Rubric for Reflective Article**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewer Name | |  | | | | |
| Manuscript Name  Or # | |  | | | | |
| **#1** Rate the manuscript on each of the criteria listed below. Proposals that do not address specific criteria should be marked “not present” for that element and given a score of 0 for that category. | | | | | | |
| Criteria | Not Present = 0 | | Low = 1 | Developing = 2 | Basic = 3 | High = 4 |
| Quality of Objective / Issue / Problem |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Lit Review/ Theory |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Analysis |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Proposed Solutions or Actions |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Implications |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Score Section 1** | | |  | | |  |
| **#2** Rate the manuscript on the criteria listed below | | | | | | |
| Criteria | Not Present = 0 | | Low = 1 | Developing = 2 | Basic = 3 | High = 4 |
| Importance of Issue |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution of Study to Field |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Writing |  | |  |  |  |  |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Total Score Section 2** |  |  | | | | | | | |
| ***Comments (these comments may or may not be shared with the author):***  What do you feel are the strengths of the paper?  What do you feel the author can do to improve the paper? (please be as specific as possible)  Additional thoughts/ comments regarding this submission: | | | | | | |

**ATE-K The Advocate: Reviewer Rubric for Book / Article Review or Critique**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewer Name | |  | | | | |
| Manuscript Name  Or # | |  | | | | |
| **#1** Rate the manuscript on each of the criteria listed below. Proposals that do not address specific criteria should be marked “not present” for that element and given a score of 0 for that category. | | | | | | |
| Criteria | Not Present = 0 | | Low = 1 | Developing = 2 | Basic = 3 | High = 4 |
| Quality of Review |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Critiques (if applicable) |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Relevance to Teacher Education |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Analysis |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Implications |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Score Section 1** | | |  | | |  |
| **#2** Rate the manuscript on the criteria listed below | | | | | | |
| Criteria | Not Present = 0 | | Low = 1 | Developing = 2 | Basic = 3 | High = 4 |
| Importance of Issues in book or article |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Contribution of Study to Field |  | |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Writing |  | |  |  |  |  |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Total Score Section 2** |  |  | | | | | | | |
| ***Comments (these comments may or may not be shared with the author):***  What do you feel are the strengths of the paper?  What do you feel the author can do to improve the review and/or critique? (please be as specific as possible)  Additional thoughts/ comments regarding this submission: | | | | | | |