Editorial Board of
"ŠKOLSKI VJESNIK" ("School Herald")

REMANDER (framework) FOR REVIEWING

I Fore notes

The magazine for pedagogical and educational issues "Školski vjesnik", which has been published in Split for fifty years, will by all means strive to publish original results of scientific researches of all those sciences and disciplines which study different aspects of education and upbringing (educational sciences), namely the works which are being published for the first time, but will also review scientific works (articles) including scientific information. (See the form at the end/in the attachment of these Reviewing Instructions).

Apart from that, Editorial board will be publishing contributions from direct education practice and notifications, reviews and overviews of books, magazines, scientific and professional meetings as well as – occasionally in a special column – short creative writings of educators.

The Editorial Board will select the given manuscripts intended for publication and classification based on the reviewers' judgment.

Reviewing, as a key element of the magazines' editorial policy, precedes the Editorial Board's on the reviewed manuscript’s publication.

A review must be scientifically based, objective and, thus, an unbiased evaluation. A reviewer can fulfill the mentioned criteria by the application of the respective scientific methods (e.g. critical analysis and synthesis) which depends on the type of work, scientific area, discipline etc.

The main objective of reviewing is to objectively evaluate a manuscript. Based on such evaluation (judgment, assessment) it can be determined whether a manuscript (work, article) deserves publication according to its scientific, professional, didactic-methodological, educational or even artistic value.

* These reviewing instructions serve indeed as a reminder in order to facilitate their production and enable the Editorial Board to make objective decisions.
There are three purposes of manuscript reviewing:
a) to raise quality of articles in the magazine (originality, scientific and professional value)
b) to ensure referencing relevant sources
c) to improve the style of writing

It is possible to review scientific and professional works in several ways. One of them is the following:

II Parts of a review

The review itself can be divided into three parts:
1 General
2 Specific
3 Conclusion and the completed standardized form

1 General part of a review

In this, general and first part of a review, attention should be focused especially on the following:

1.1. The volume and the content structure of a work (article):

It is necessary to include the overall volume of a work and its structure, including the volume of its specific parts (chapters, sections, paragraphs etc.).

1.2. Critical analysis of the article's structure and content

- to shortly display and critically analyze certain parts of a manuscript (sections, paragraphs etc.). Special emphasis should be made on the composition (or structure) of an article:
  - Is the order of specific parts logical?
  - Do the parts of a work fit into a homogeneous unit?
  - Is the decimal system consistently applied, if it is applied in the elaboration of a text?
2 Specific part of a review

2.1. The title of an article

It should be judged and assessed if the title of an article suits its content.

2.2. Topicality of an article

A reviewer needs to make a specific and scientifically, i.e. professionally, correct evaluation of the article's content, whether it is topical or not due to research results that it consists, applied methodology, new systematization, or according to scientific facts, theories, attitudes, conclusions, data etc. In accordance with such evaluation, an assessment follows: does the article with its content contribute to the development of theory and (or) practice, and respectively does it contain new results or it deals with just an analysis and synthesis of the already published results, is it interesting enough to be published. This part of a review should include a well-founded argumentation on whether an article is interesting for publishing or not. If necessary, it should make specific suggestions of quality and content improvement of article’s topicalization.

2.3. Article's volume

It should be established whether an article needs to be shortened, completed or expanded. If an article needs to be altered (shortened or expanded), it should be specifically added in which parts it should be done and explained why it is necessary.

2.4. Terminology, style and language

It is to be determined whether an article uses comprehensive and standard terms accepted in Croatian and world's professional terminology. It is also necessary to evaluate to which extent an article's presentation is systematic, logical, simple, comprehensive, and legible. Possible terminological and stylistic objections should be explained and appropriate improvement suggestions should be made.

This does not refer to grammatical and orthographic correctness of a manuscript (which is a language editor's job) as much as to the manner of presenting scientific information due to the clarity of an author's thoughts. "Clarity, simplicity and brevity as well as a logical course of thoughts and demonstrations" are the
characteristics of scientific style. Remarks and corrections concerning grammar and orthography should be left to the language editor of the magazine. It is advisable for a reviewer to forewarn to possible typing and logical errors.

2.5. Illustrations

Illustrations denote all supplements which illustrate the content of an article (text). Those include: tables, images, drawings, schemes, histograms, graphs, maps and photographs. A reviewer should determine if illustrations are correctly formed, clear and visible enough, and if they clearly illustrate certain phenomena. It is also necessary to explain remarks and suggest changes if illustrations are not correctly formed.

2.6. Quotes

It is fundamental that a reviewer establishes if an article's author correctly quoted other authors in an accustomed manner of scientific and professional writing, and if he/she accurately added the sources of taken scientific facts, illustrations, definitions, data etc. According to this, a reviewer will suggest the solutions which would improve the quality of an article.

2.7. References (Bibliography)

This implies a critical and really short evaluation of an author's use of the respective Croatian and world's sources and his/her list of the quoted sources in accordance with the instructions of the Editorial Board (imprinted on the inner side of the cover).
3. Conclusion

In the concluding part of a review a **concise and augmented evaluation of a manuscript** should be made. A reviewer makes a **suggestion of an article's categorization** and a **clear proposal of publishing or not publishing an article** in the magazine, depending on the conditions under which a manuscript can be published. At the end of his/her review a reviewer completes the form (enclosed in these Instructions) in two copies. Only one of them needs to be signed, but both should be returned to the Editorial board.

________________

*Note:* The magazine publishes the following categories of works:

1. Original scientific article
2. Preliminary communication
3. Review article
4. Conference article
5. Professional article
6. Other _______________________

(complete)