The Charter Schools Resource Journal (TCSRJ) Reviewer Guidelines and Response Form

What is the Charter Schools Resource Journal?

The Charter Schools Resource Journal is a professional journal published by the National Charter Schools Institute, in partnership with Central Michigan University College of Education and Human Services. The journal serves the National Charter Schools Institute (NCSI) members and other persons or institutions interested in educational theory, research, and practice in PreK-12 school settings with a focus on charter schools. TCSRJ provides an open forum to encourage and promote the construction and exchange of ideas that will expand knowledge and understanding of instructional models, innovations, and best practices for charter school classroom teachers and school leaders and general educators as well.

What does a reviewer for the Charter Schools Resource Journal do?

As a member of the Editorial Review Board or as an ad hoc reviewer, you will be asked to anonymously review manuscripts submitted to TCSRJ. Review Board members review one to two manuscripts per issue, and ad hoc reviewers are invited to review as needed. TCSRJ aims to publish twice per year.

Reviewer Response Form

There are three sections in the Reviewer Response Form. Section one provides you the opportunity to rate the paper based on types of paper—research paper, literature review paper, position paper, and professional practice paper. Section two allows you to provide the comments for authors in a narrative form. Section three provides you the space to communicate with the editors in terms of accepting, accepting with revision, or rejecting the paper.

You will receive from us a Manuscript Review Memo with each article. The Review Memo will identify you as the reviewer, the date of the request, the due date for the review, and the manuscript number. We allow three weeks for you to read and respond to the manuscript. Please note that your adhering to the return deadline is very important in our review process.
Reviewer Response Form

• Your name:
• Your e-mail:
• Manuscript number:
• Date:

Section 1: Rating for Research Paper

Please rate the submission: 1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good; 4 = excellent.

• The research problem is significant. 1---2---3---4
• The purpose is well defined. 1---2---3---4
• The theoretical framework is well developed. 1---2---3---4
• The literature review is current and adequate. 1---2---3---4
• The research method is sound. 1---2---3---4
• The conclusion is well supported. 1---2---3---4
• The manuscript is lively and engaging 1---2---3---4
• The manuscript will appeal to CSRJ’s diverse audience 1---2---3---4
Section 1: Rating for Literature Review Paper

Please rate the submission: 1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good; 4 = excellent.

• The topic is important. 1---2---3---4
• The purpose is well defined. 1---2---3---4
• The scope is appropriate to the topic. 1---2---3---4
• The literature review is well balanced. 1---2---3---4
• It provides meaningful insights for the practitioner. 1---2---3---4
• The manuscript is lively and engaging 1---2---3---4
• The manuscript will appeal to TCSRJ’s diverse audience 1---2---3---4
Section 1: Rating for Position Paper

Please rate the submission: 1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good; 4 = excellent.

• The topic is important and timely. 1---2---3---4
• The purpose is clear and well defined. 1---2---3---4
• It compares and contrasts points of views. 1---2---3---4
• The literature review is pertinent and current. 1---2---3---4
• It provides meaningful insights for the practitioner. 1---2---3---4
• The manuscript is lively and engaging 1---2---3---4
• The manuscript will appeal to TCSRJ’s diverse audience 1---2---3---4
Section 1: Rating for Professional Practice Paper

Please rate the submission: 1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good; 4 = excellent.

- The topic is current and important. 1---2---3---4
- The purpose is well defined. 1---2---3---4
- The description of the practice is sound. 1---2---3---4
- The solution is applicable. 1---2---3---4
- The literature review is pertinent and current. 1---2---3---4
- It provides meaningful advice for the practitioner. 1---2---3---4
- The manuscript is lively and engaging 1---2---3---4
- The manuscript will appeal to TCSRJ’s diverse audience 1---2---3---4
Section 2: Comments for Authors

Please provide a brief evaluation of this manuscript, taking into consideration the criteria pertinent to the type of the paper. Comments for authors should be numbered so that authors can respond/rebut on a point-by-point basis and reviewers can easily determine, during subsequent reviews, whether each comment has been adequately addressed. Please note: This section of the review will be given to the author with your name removed.
Section 3: Recommendation to Editors

Indicate your recommendation to the editors (select only one).

- Accept with only minor changes to be made by editorial staff
- Accept with minor revisions to be made by the author
- Revise and resubmit for another round of reviews
- Reject

Comments: