

**Policy of reviewing scientific articles,
which are published in collections of scientific works
State Higher Educational Institution
«University of Educational Management»**

(approved at the session of the Scientific Board

June 20, 2018, protocol № 6)

Collections of scientific works of the State Higher Educational Institution «University of Educational Management»:

1. «Bulletin of Postgraduate Education» (series: «Educational sciences»; «Social and behavioural sciences»; «Management and administration»);

2. Electronic scientific special edition «Theory and methodology of education management».

Author's manuscripts of articles that come to the editorial board (with the exception of reviews, articles and messages of an informational nature) necessarily have a review procedure.

The purpose of the review is to ensure the quality of the printed materials of scientific collections through an independent professional evaluation of the article content and its conformity to scientific works according to national and international quality parameters, which promotes the positive image and popularity of publications in scientific circles.

The review procedure provides for a comprehensive material analysis of the article, the objective assessment of its content, structure and style of writing, determining the compliance of the article with the requirements for articles in the scientific collections of the University. Only those articles that are of scientific value and which contribute to solving current problems of science and practice are accepted for publication.

Articles are reviewed by two independent experts who provide written conclusions. The review procedure is anonymous for both the reviewer and the authors. Reviewers are reported that the manuscripts sent to them are the intellectual property of the authors and belong to the information that is not subject to disclosure. Reviewers are not allowed to

make copies of the article submitted for review or to use the materials of the article prior to its publication. The review is based on confidentiality, when information about the article (terms of receipt, content, stages, and peculiarities of the review, comments and suggestions of reviewers, the final publication decision) are not communicated to anyone other than authors and reviewers. Violation of this requirement is possible only in the presence of signs or statements regarding the unreliability or falsification of materials of the article. By agreement (willing) of authors and reviewers together with the article can be published with comments of reviewers. The author of the manuscript is given an opportunity to get acquainted with the text of the review, in particular, if he does not agree with the conclusions of the reviewer.

ORDER OF MANUSCRIPTS REVIEWING

1. The author submits an article to the editorial board that comply with the requirements for the articles in the scientific editions of the SHEI ««University of Educational Management» and the general rules for the preparation scientific works for publication. Manuscripts that do not comply with the requirements are not registered and are not allowed for further consideration (authors are informed about this).

2. The author's manuscripts, coming to the editorial board are initially evaluated by the responsible secretary for the presence of all structural components (annotations, information about the author, a review (for authors who do not have academic degree), and amount of the manuscript) and sent on the research profile – to two reviewers. Reviewers are appointed by editor-in-chief or deputy chief editor of the edition.

3. For the review of articles reviewers may act as members of the editorial board of scientific publications, as well as highly qualified specialists who have deep professional knowledge and experience of work on a specific scientific direction, usually doctors of sciences, professors.

4. After receiving the article for review (within 5 days), the reviewer evaluates the content of the article. The review periods may vary, in exceptional cases, according to the conditions prevailing for the most objective evaluation of the quality of the materials provided. If there is a conflict between the interests of the author and the reviewer, the reviewer has the right to refuse to review and notify the editorial board. The editorial board should decide on the appointment of another reviewer.

5. The reviewer gives an opinion on the possibility / impossibility of placing the article in the scientific collection or on the need to finalize and post in the next edition of the publication.

6. The review is conducted confidentially on the principles of double-blind review (double-blind review, when neither the author nor the reviewer knows about each other). Interaction between the author and the reviewers is carried out through the responsible secretary of the publication via correspondence by e-mail. At the request of the reviewer and in agreement with the editor-in-chief or deputy editor-in-chief, the interaction between

the author and the reviewer can take place in an open mode (such a decision is made only if the openness of the interaction helps to improve the style and logic of the research material).

7. For all articles submitted for review, the degree of uniqueness of the author's text is determined by means of the corresponding software (in particular, the freeware service «*eTXТAntiplagiat*»).

8. After the final analysis, the reviewer fills in the standardized form (Addition), which provides recommendations for improving the material of the article. In this case, generally accepted recommendations regarding the sequence of organization of the review process are used and summarized (Review Quality Instrument). The editor informs the author about the results of the review by e-mail.

9. If the reviewer indicates the necessity of making certain corrections to the article, the article is sent to the author with the suggestion to take into account the comments when preparing the updated version of the article or to argue them to refute them. After finalization of the article, the author sends it together with a letter in which he substantiates the decision to accept or refuse the recommendations of the reviewers and explains all the changes that have been made in the text. The corrected version of the article is re-submitted to the reviewer for the decision and preparation of the conclusion about the possibility of publication. The date of acceptance for publication of the article is the date of receive by the editorial staff of a positive opinion of the reviewer (or the decision of the editorial board) regarding the relevance and possibility of publication of the article.

10. If the reviewer does not agree with the opinion of the author, the author has the right to provide a reasoned response to the editorial office. In this case, the article is considered at a session of the editorial board. The editorial board may send the article for additional review to another specialist. The editorial board reserves the right to reject articles in case of impossibility or unwillingness of the author to take into accounts the wishes and comments of reviewers. At the request of the reviewer, the editorial board may submit the article to another reviewer, with the obligatory observance of the principles of double-blind review.

11. The final decision on the possibility and relevance of publication is accepted by the editor-in-chief (or deputy editor-in-chief), and, if necessary, by the decision of the editorial board as a whole. After accepting the decision to allow the article to be published, the responsible secretary will inform the author about this and the expected publication period.

12. In case of receiving a positive decision about the possibility of publishing the article, the responsible secretary attaches it to the content of the next issue of the scientific collection, which is approved at the session of the Scientific Board of the SHEI «University of Educational Management», which is marked with a corresponding note on the second page of the publication.

13. The technical editor is presented with an article approved for publication. Minor corrections of a stylistic or formal nature that do not affect the content of the article are made by the technical editor without the consent of the author. If necessary or at the author's request, the manuscript in the form of a model of the article is returned to the author for approval.

14. The author and reviewer are responsible for the reliability of the facts and data presented, the validity of the conclusions of the study and recommendations, the scientific and practical level of the article.

FORM OF REVIEW

Title of the article _____

Name and surname of the reviewer _____

Date of receiving article for review _____

1. The content of the article corresponds to the topic (profile) of the journal:

Yes.

No.

2. The title of the article corresponds to the content of the material and its purpose:

Yes.

No.

Title suggestions: _____

3. Remarks on annotations:

no remarks;

need to be expanded;

need to be reduced;

the content of the annotation does not correspond to the content of the research;

clarify the content (see comment);

other.

Keywords are adequate articles (not less than 5 words):

Yes.

No.

Comments: _____

4. The manuscript does not include the following structural components:

formulation of the problem;

analysis of recent researches and publications;

the purpose of the article;

conclusions;

all structural elements are available.

5. Relevance of the research is substantiated:

sufficiently;

not enough.

6. Originality of the material:

- available;
- not present.

7. Notes on the analysis of literary sources and publications:

- no remarks;
- no references to some sources;
- some sources do not match the content of the research;
- availability of foreign sources;
- lack of new sources (or outdated sources);
- should be finalized.

Comments: _____

8. Remarks to the article's purpose:

- no remarks;
- needs clarification;
- does not correspond to the content of the material.

Comments: _____

9. Is scientific reasoning in the content of the article logical and convincing?

- Yes.
- No.

Are the results of the study methodologically correctly presented?

- Yes.
- No.

The text of the article needs to be edited:

- stylistic inaccuracies;
- clarification of terminology;
- spelling mistakes;
- punctuation mistakes;
- grammatical mistakes;
- scientific editing.

Comments: _____

10. Plagiarism:

- available;

- separate elements of the article;
- not present.

11. Conclusions:

- no remarks;
- do not correspond to the structure and tasks of the article;
- not sufficiently substantiated.

11. Recommendations for the editorial board (choose):

- Accept an article – the article is ready for publication and is accepted without changes.
- It is necessary to make corrections – it is accepted, if the author will take into account the given comments.
- Return to re-review – necessary revision of the article and re-reviewing it.
- Send to another edition – because the subject on the topic reveals another direction of research and does not correspond to the thematic policy of the journal.
- Reject an article – an article does not comply the requirements of the publication, contains plagiarism or other reason indicated by the reviewer.

Additional comments and suggestions to the author _____

Signature of the reviewer _____

Date of submission of the review to the editorial office _____