**Meet the Editors – How Excellent Reviewing Helps Your Scholarship**

**Journal of Management Education and Management Teaching Review**

*Abstract*

Come celebrate our Society’s journals – the *Journal of Management Education* and *Management Teaching Review*. In this session, a group of JME and MTR editors will engage participants in understanding what makes a great manuscript review, and the links between excellent reviewing work and publishing success. Participants will have access to real examples of reviews across a spectrum of quality and helpfulness, and gain reviewing skills to enhance their own scholarship and SOTL reputation.
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**Participating editors:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Jeanie M. Forray  | Sarah Wright  |
| Kathy Lund Dean  | Paul Donovan |
| Kathi Lovelace  | Charles Fornaciari  |

**Introduction & Session description**

Crafting great reviews offers many benefits to the reviewer, including learning about cutting-edge literature, contributing to the scholarly community, understanding the overall publishing process, and earning a reputation as a scholar whose own work is informed by current manuscript review. This 60 minute workshop contributes to scholarly knowledge generation by addressing best practices in creating developmental and high quality reviews for any outlet, but particularly SOTL journals. Participants will have access to real examples of reviews in a variety of forms to inform their own scholarship efforts.

*Reviewing*

Most peer review systems such as ScholarOne and many conference submission systems such as the Academy of Management allow editors and peers to rate reviewer quality on a variety of constructs, and we will discuss what those are and how to respond to review requests in reciprocally beneficial ways. After a brief introduction, the editors will introduce the philosophy of developmental reviewing that has made MOBTS journals the gold standard for the SOTL community, and share a set of best practices for doing developmental peer review. Best practices characteristics include: 1) Content/technical aspects; 2) Organizational aspects; 3) Tonal aspects; and 4) Balance. Lively discussions should follow as we cover these concepts and norms.

The session will include opportunities for participants to discuss their own experiences with reviews, both doing them and receiving them. The editors will offer examples of excellent developmental reviews, and what makes them excellent. They also have examples of not-so-great reviews, and participants will have an opportunity to discuss in small groups what they are missing, and how they could be improved. Within a supportive environment by which participants may share their own experiences with reviewing, they will gain developmental reviewing skills that are transferable to any SOTL outlet.

**Session description & timeline Allocation Elapsed**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Introduce session participants and editors | 5 minutes | 5 minutes |
| Dyad/triad catalyst reflection, then large group sharing: * What have been your past experiences with reviewing?
* What was your best experience with getting reviews, and what made it great?
 | 10 minutes | 15 minutes |
| Editors’ framing: a manuscript’s journey, and aspects of an excellent developmental review. * Content/technical aspects
* Organizational aspects
* Tonal aspects
* Balance
* Linking editor-only comments with author comments
 | 15 minutes | 30 minutes |
| Offer examples of actual reviews (anonymous & from older submissions) for roundtable discussions, facilitated by editors | 20 minutes | 50 minutes |
| Whole group debrief and resources distribution* Small group discussions: what happened? What did you learn?
* Distribute 2 handouts about publishing and reviewing with practical tips
* Invite to review for *JME* & *MTR,* indicating how to sign up
 | 10 minutes | 60 minutes |