POD23 REVIEWER TRAINING REFRESHER GUIDE

Growth and Community Mindset & Approach

✓	X
A review that is clear and constructive not only is helpful to the author but also enhances the author's confidence that the review process was carefully executed by knowledgeable reviewers.	The review process is not a place to impose your personal opinions
The goal is to provide feedback to strengthen and improve the author's work	Focus on the content, not what you wish the author would have included
Assume the author's claims have merit and focus on substantive issues	Reviewers should not let their own research agenda or pet peeves interfere with reviews
Sensitivity to the author's experience goes a long way. Use tact, be mindful, thoughtful, considerate, kind, and compassionate. We are building our POD community	If you find yourself getting passionate while reviewing, you may need to pause and reread your reviews
Proofread your review before you click submit	Be aware of your own biases

Proposal Reviews

Rating

4	3	2	1	Not Applicable
Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	
no concerns or questions	few minor concerns or questions	concerns or questions that should be addressed by authors	significant concerns or questions which MUST be addressed	does not factor into or diminish a proposal's final score

Overall Recommendation

- ACCEPT = if your ratings are mostly 4s, your comments to the authors should illustrate that the proposal is excellent and why you believe so (average score of 3 or higher).

- ACCEPT WITH RESERVATION = reservations should be addressed IN comments to the authors and MUST also be reflected in the ratings (average score of 2).

- REJECTION = reviewers who recommend rejecting a proposal can provide helpful encouragement (consistent 1s and 2s).

- FLAG SOLICITATIONS in the designated check box - materials nor services may be offered for sale during the session; pre-conference workshop presenters may receive permission to charge an additional fee for materials (such as books) to be collected with the conference registration fee.

Baseline Expectations for Equity & Inclusion

Assessing Inclusive Strategies

Assess how the presenters plan to support all participants, particularly those who historically and contemporarily may not feel a sense of **belonging** across identity, ability, and perspective.

Select one of three categories that best describes the proposed inclusive strategies: meets expectations, needs revision, does not meet expectations.

Meets Expectations	Needs Revision	Does Not Meet Expectations
the DEI considerations shared are intentional and thoughtful	the authors would need less than one hour of dedicated time	the proposal will require substantive revision

Common Rater Errors

- **Halo Effect**: tendency to make inappropriate generalizations about content or intent
- **Leniency**: tendency to evaluate all proposals as outstanding and give inflated ratings
- **Central Tendency**: tendency to evaluate every proposal as average
- **Strictness**: tendency to rate all proposals at the low end and overly critical
- **First Impression Error**: tendency to make an initial favorable or unfavorable judgment
- **The Similar-to-Me Effect**: tendency to more favorably judge proposals perceived as similar to yourself and your scholarly work

The Halo Effect

Leniency

Central Tendency

Unconscious biases are social stereotypes about certain groups of people that individuals form outside their own conscious awareness.

They stem from one's tendency to organize social worlds by categorizing.

Strictness

First Impression

Similar-to-Me-Effect

To minimize errors, ask yourself, am I basing my rating on the content in the proposal or am I making judgments based on my own perceptions and generalizations about the author's work?