

DRAFT Process for Case Study Review and Production

1. “Responsible Group” (e. g., CEPC, Diversity Committee) appoints a “Responsible Party” who serves as point of contact with the SAA Publications Program.
2. “Responsible Party” consults with Publications Editor and issues (a) a call for case studies of a particular sort (i.e., ethics, diversity, campus case studies) and (b) a template that provides a prescribed format/citation style. Case study template has following basic structure with sections fleshing out what should be required in three areas:
 - i. Intro/context/problem statement
 - ii. Methodology/Narrative
 - iii. Analysis/Discussion
 - iv. Citations
3. Author submits case study directly to “Responsible Party,” who functions as “Series Editor” for that group’s case studies.
4. “Responsible Party” sends the case study to one or two member of the group (single blind review process), along with a rubric. [See pages 2–3. The rubric would be published on publications area of the website with links in the respective groups’ areas, so authors know the criteria and process being used.]
5. Peer reviewer(s) returns case study with completed rubric to “Responsible Party” within two weeks.
6. “Responsible Party” makes publication decision.
7. Once “Responsible Party” decides Case Study is acceptable, it is sent to Publications Editor and Director of Publications, who give it a quick look-see and mark-up any egregious grammar/style problems.
8. Director of Publishing returns it to the “Responsible Party” who then sends it to the Author for quick revisions and resubmission of revised content.
9. “Responsible Party” resubmits final content to SAA. Case study converted to PDF and posted to SAA website. [Ultimately, it would be best to have some other technology to support these, to minimize the production elements.]
10. Copyright retained by Author, but published by SAA under Creative Commons licensing (CC-BY-ND).

Rubric for Peer Reviewed Case Studies Developed under Publications Program Oversight

Case Study Series:	Case Study Author and Title:
Responsible Group/Editor: /	Reviewer:

Instructions for the Peer Reviewer: Referring to the description/template for the case study series to which this pieces was submitted, please highlight or shade the box that best matches your judgment. Your ratings will not be shared directly with the author, but comments may be shared, as noted below. When you have completed your review, please return the form to: _____

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Comments (may be shared with author)
Relevance of the Topic	<u>Highly relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the case study series to which it was submitted	<u>Somewhat relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the case study series to which it was submitted	<u>Marginally relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the case study series to which it was submitted	<u>Not relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the of the case study series to which it was submitted	
Context and Statement of Problem or Purpose	<u>Excellent</u> statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge	<u>Good</u> statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge	<u>Fair</u> statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge	<u>Poor</u> statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge	
Methodology/Narrative	<u>Thoroughly develops</u> major points with relevant evidence and solid reasoning	<u>Adequately develops</u> major points with evidence and reasoning	<u>Somewhat develops</u> major points with evidence and reasoning	Contains <u>major problems</u> with the quality of the evidence and reasoning	
Analysis/Discussion	Analyzes or discusses issues in a <u>sophisticated and thought-provoking</u> fashion	Analyzes or discusses issues in a <u>good or adequate</u> fashion	Analyzes or discusses issues in a <u>minimally acceptable</u> fashion (could benefit from additional development)	Analyzes or discusses issues in an <u>incomplete or unacceptable</u> fashion	
Organization	<u>Excellent</u> organization of ideas and supporting points, fully <u>complies</u> with case study template	<u>Good</u> organization of ideas and supporting points; <u>substantially complies</u> with case studies template	<u>Fair</u> organization of ideas and supporting points; <u>marginally complies</u> with case studies template	<u>Poor</u> organization of ideas and supporting points; <u>does not comply</u> with case studies template	
Mechanics	<u>Few</u> to no errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	<u>Some</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	<u>Many</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	<u>Major</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	

Recommendation:

- _____ **Accept in current form.** The case study is acceptable for publication, with minor copyediting.
- _____ **Accept subject to revision by author.** Please describe suggested revisions above or in the “Additional Comments for Authors” (next page).
- _____ **Reject.** The article does not merit publication or is not suitable for this series.

Additional Comments for the Author: