

Review Committee Guidelines for ICA-SUV Annual Conferences

ICA-SUV uses an open peer review system in which the members of the Review Committee are identified but the Committee members do not have access to any information to identify who submitted the proposal. This is to ensure that the review process is transparent and impartial and that presenters meet professional standards of the archives field.

Review Guidelines and Proposal Submission Guidelines are available on the ICA-SUV website, the relevant conference website and will be referred to in any calls for submitting paper proposals. Guidelines will be available in ICA's official languages, English and French, and in as many other languages as possible.

1. The Review Committee consists of a Chair and a number of ordinary members (hereafter "reviewers"), appropriate to the number of submissions to be reviewed, who are all approved by the Section Bureau in consultation with the Programme Committee. In accordance with the Conference Planning Guidelines, the Review Committee should be established no later than 8 months before the date of the conference.
2. The Chair of the Programme Committee serves as non-voting, ex-officio Chair of the Review Committee. The ordinary members of the Review Committee will include at least one member from the ICA-SUV Section Bureau and at least one from the annual conference Programme Committee.
3. The chair of the review committee and reviewers are barred from submitting proposals for the ICA-SUV conference they are reviewing.
4. To be nominated, all members of the review committee have to be established professionals of the field (both practicing or recently retired archivists and archival educators) and must have a track record of publications and/or review experience for similar conferences. While the majority of the review committee members do not need to be ICA/SUV members, there should be a clear ICA/SUV presence on the Review Committee.
5. At least three Reviewers must be able to review proposals submitted in each of the official ICA languages, English and French.
6. Reviewers cannot serve as reviewers for two consecutive years.
7. The chair of the committee is responsible for removing all personally identifiable information from each proposal by removing names, institutional identifiers, and addresses. Each redacted proposal is assigned a consecutive number and then sent

to reviewers (a minimum of two reviewers per proposal) within two weeks of submission deadline.

8. The Chair will provide Reviewers with a clear procedure for evaluating a proposal and a check-list for accepting/rejecting proposals. (See Appendix below.)

9. Reviewers must evaluate proposals within the stipulated deadline (normally two weeks) and submit their evaluations to the chair of the committee by the end of that period. Reviewers who do not fulfill their obligations will be replaced with another reviewer with the approval of the Section Bureau.

10. Each proposal will be accepted/rejected by a majority vote.

11. The Chair of the committee will create a final list of approved proposals to be published within a week of receiving the evaluations. The Chair will announce the list on the conference website or on the ICA-SUV website if the conference website is not up yet, and at least 4 months before the annual conference in order to inform prospective presenters. If an accepted presenter needs an official invitation letter in order to participate at the conference, the program committee will send such letters upon request (this might be necessary in order to obtain visas).

12. If the review process does not result in a sufficient number of papers to fill the program, proposals that were rejected but received at least one positive review will be reviewed a second time.

13. If more proposals are approved than available program slots, the successful programs will be revisited by the Review Committee and reduced in number by establishing a priority ranking via majority vote of the regular Review Committee members within two weeks or less.

Appendix: at the very minimum, the Chair should provide reviewers with accept/reject check boxes, and the Chair may also provide additional check lists or rating scales that incorporate objective and verifiable criteria for evaluation. For Example:

Reviewers are asked to consider the following criteria:

General

1. Is the proposal new (i.e. it has not been presented at a previous ICA conference)?
2. Does the proposal adequately address one or all of the themes and questions of the conference?

3. Is the proposal analytical? If particular projects and case studies are presented does the proposal describe how the project/case study will contribute to the further development of archival theory and practice.

4. Does the proposal contribute new knowledge to the field?

Subject Treatment

1. Does the proposal cover its stated objective?

2. Are descriptions clear and presented in enough detail?

3. Does the title reflect clearly the content of the article?

4. Is the subject closely related to the stated theme of the conference?

X Accept

X Reject

Whenever a list of criteria such as these is to be used, it should be made known in the Call for Proposals so that all people submitting proposals will be informed of the basis on which their proposal will be evaluated.

Approved by SUV Section Bureau 27 November 2010
Revision approved by Section Bureau 7 July 2014.