***Christian Perspectives in Education***

***Best Practices and “How To” Reviewer Form***

This form is provided as an example. The digital form that the reviewer completes is accessed through the reviewers Digital Commons account. Upon login, the reviewer will see the “Submissions for Review” link and click on the title of the manuscript he or she is reviewing to access the from that is to be completed.

**Part 1. LikertScale Review**

(Prepare this chart as a Microsoft Word document along with the corresponding narrative. You will submit it online via the “Submit Review” Link.)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent  | Good  | Fair | Poor | N/A |
| Relevancy and Appropriateness  |
| The content is appropriate and relevant for the CPE audience. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The content specifically and clearly addresses Christian perspectives related to education. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Christian perspective is well integrated throughout the manuscript. Christian perspective is not an “afterthought” or simply “tacked on”  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Writing  |
| Writing is clear and the manuscript has coherent, parsimonious, logical, and internally consistent structure.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The most recent edition of the APA style manual is followed.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The manuscript is relatively free from grammar and spelling errors. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Introduction/ Review of Literature  |
|  |
| Literature is used to provide solid rationale for the practice/ method. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The introduction or review of literature is well constructed, both organized and focused. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Methods/ Practice  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear parameters for application or implementation are provided. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The procedures are clearly explained. Sufficient detail is given for replication.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The overall methods or practice are quality.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriate qualitative or quantitative evaluation is explained or posed for the method or practice.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion / Conclusion |
| Logical conclusions are drawn. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Implications for future research and practice are included. |  |  |  |  |  |
| References  |
| Citations match in the body and in the reference section and vice versa.  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Part 2. Narrative Review**

(Prepare this as a Microsoft Word document with the above checklist. You will submit it online via the “Submit Review” Link.)

Please provide a narrative in regard to each of these topics to support your ratings above.

1. Significance and Relevancy
2. Writing Quality
3. Contents of the Manuscript including Technical Quality
4. Additional feedback for the author

**Part 3. Reviewer Recommendation**

(You will check off your recommendation online via the “Submit Review” Link.)

Please indicate one of the recommendations below when submitting your report.

1. Accept with no revisions
2. Accept with minor revisions
3. Accept with major revisions
4. Reject
5. Inappropriate for journal; the following journals are suggested:

**Part 4. Cover Letter**

(This is to be prepared as a Microsoft Word Document separate from Parts 1, 2, and 3. This document allows you to communicate privately with the editor. You will submit it online via the “Submit Review” link.)

This will be your chance to communicate privately with the editors of CPE. It will not be shared with the others.