

JVSE Article Submission Review Form

Dear Reviewer:

Thank you for agreeing to review a contribution submitted to *JVSE*. We use a double-blind review process, where the authors are not explicitly revealed to reviewers, and reviewers are not revealed to authors.

We ask that you complete your review and return it to Amanda Gonczi via email at journal@vast.org within **two weeks** of receiving this request. If something unexpected arises that will keep you from completing the review by the deadline, please contact us immediately.

If you have a conflict of interest (e.g., collaborator on the program described in the article) that will prevent you from providing an objective review of the contribution, please do not check the box under the 1st criterion listed below. We will then ask someone else to review the manuscript.

Please review the contribution based on the criteria given below. Space is available to make comments under each criterion, but feel free to skip an item if you do not think it applies to the contribution.

We appreciate your anonymous comments, which will help us assess the quality of the submitted article and determine whether it should be included in an upcoming issue of *JVSE*. Descriptive and constructive feedback is also very helpful in guiding the author in revising the manuscript.

Review Criteria

(please make comments as appropriate under each item)

I do not know of any conflict of interest with reviewing this contribution and I can provide an objective review of the manuscript.

Based upon the designation of the article please complete section A, B, or C. All reviewers must complete section D.

Section A: Activity-based article

1. Is the activity/content grade-level appropriate and is there evidence that the activity/strategy has actually been used in the classroom?
2. Is the activity safe at the recommended grade level? Are appropriate safety procedures included? List any missing safety considerations that you feel are necessary for this activity.
3. Are relevant standards and learning objectives provided?
4. Is there sufficient detail that a reader can replicate the activity? For example, are all materials listed? Is the amount of time needed to implement the lesson provided? What additional information might a teacher need?

5. Are formative and summative assessments described? Are the assessments objective, practical, and do they incorporate grade-level appropriate language? Are rubrics and answer keys provided? Is there sufficient guidance for interpreting student performance?
6. Is the activity interesting and new? Is it similar to another activity from a print or online source? Does the manuscript promote a person or commercial product/service?
7. Does the activity facilitate higher-order thinking skills and/or engagement in science and engineering practices? Will the activity support deeper understanding and application of content?
8. Is the manuscript inclusive with regard to gender, multicultural awareness, and costs? Are differentiation strategies provided?

Section B: Research

1. Is the rationale/research focus clearly situated within the existing literature on the topic?
2. Does the article identify a clear research focus? (e.g. are the research questions clearly identified)
3. Are methods sufficiently described? Are they appropriate to answer the research question?
4. Is the data appropriately aggregated or blinded so that a reader would not be able to identify any characteristics associated with individual persons or places involved in the research?
5. Is the data sufficient to answer the research question(s)?
6. Are conclusions warranted based upon the given data?

Section C: Sharing Solutions

1. Is there a clear education-related challenge and solution described in the article?
2. Is the information interesting and new? Is it similar to another article from a print or online source? Does the manuscript promote a person or commercial product/service?
3. Is the manuscript inclusive with regard to gender, multicultural awareness, and costs? Are differentiation strategies for individuals with special needs provided?
4. Is there sufficient detail that a reader can implement strategies/solutions described in the article? Is it clear the range of situations that are appropriate for the strategy/solution?

Section D: General (all reviewers MUST complete this section)

1. Does this article provide information that would be useful to teachers in Virginia?
2. Is the manuscript accurate, scientifically and otherwise? Explain any inaccuracies and provide page and/or paragraph numbers.
3. Are in text citations in APA format and a reference list included?
4. Is the manuscript easy to read and logically sequenced? Does it flow well from start to finish?
5. Is the manuscript an appropriate length for the content? If not what should be added or removed?
6. **Overall recommendation for this manuscript (check one):**

Accept
Send for minor revision
Send for major revision
Reject with encouragement to rewrite/resubmit
Reject

Overall Rating (check one):

Good (high potential)
Fair (medium potential)
Poor (low potential)

Comments to the editor that you **do not** wish to be shared with the author:

Summary comments for the author including anything that does not fit any section above: