

6-1-2023

How to Review for the Journal of Case Learning and Exceptional Learners

Jeongae Kang
Illinois State University

Kathryn L. Haughney
Georgia Southern University

Victoria VanUitert
Bowling Green State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/jclel>

Recommended Citation

Kang, Jeongae; Haughney, Kathryn L.; and VanUitert, Victoria (2023) "How to Review for the Journal of Case Learning and Exceptional Learners," *The Journal of Case Learning and Exceptional Learners*: Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 3.

<https://doi.org/10.20429/jclel.2023.010103>

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/jclel/vol1/iss1/3>

This editor's guide is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Journal of Case Learning and Exceptional Learners by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.



EDITORS' GUIDE



HOW TO REVIEW FOR THE *JOURNAL OF CASE LEARNING AND EXCEPTIONAL LEARNERS*

AUTHORS: JEONGAE KANG, KATHRYN L. HAUGHNEY, & VICTORIA J. VANUITERT

The *Journal of Case Learning and Exceptional Learners* (JCLEL) is dedicated to disseminating special education case studies centering individuals with moderate to extensive living and learning needs. The journal may expand its scope to include students with low support needs in the future, but the current scope is designed to fill a pressing need identified by Kang et al. (2022). Although case studies provide authentic learning experiences for teacher candidates to bridge course knowledge with instructional practices, teacher educators in special education may have difficulty locating quality case studies because there are few case studies for students with moderate to extensive support needs (M-ESN). Furthermore, even if case studies are located, they may need more comprehensive detailed information than is available to help teacher candidates better understand the student being described in the case study (Kang et al., 2022; Storey, 2019). Manuscript submissions to JCLEL will undergo an initial review by one of the co-editors-in-chief to determine whether they meet basic standards for the quantity of information, quality of writing, authenticity (given the included

positionality statement), and overall fit to the journal (see Initial Screening details below).

JCLEL was established to fill the gaps in special education teacher training and is committed to serving as a secure repository for special education case studies to be shared. That said, reviewers should bear in mind that JCLEL's target reader may be any professional interested in supporting the learning of all students (including but not limited to a variety of education support personnel, administration, and families). The editorial board of JCLEL views peer review as central to the journal's mission. In the spirit of "nothing about us without us," we believe that descriptions of students in the field must include those students as collaborators whenever possible. At a minimum, our descriptions of students and their experiences should be accountable and respectful to those students, teachers, and researchers that each case is designed to capture. As such, JCLEL established the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Council to address our aims and scope as they apply to case study representation. The council seeks students, practitioners, and researchers with diverse

perspectives on the teaching and learning experiences of individuals with M-ESN. The DEI council will meet regularly to discuss pertinent issues, provide recommendations for future *JCLEL* efforts, and address any specific case study concerns raised by reviewers.

The role of the reviewer is to provide feedback to the authors of the manuscript. Suggestions for manuscript changes should include comments related to the conceptual clarity of the manuscript, APA formatting concerns, conceptual position within the current literature, and the basic standards listed above. Based on the knowledge a reviewer has related to the assigned case, they should ensure that the descriptions align well with the aim of the journal to provide an accurate and respectful representation of the case subjects. Descriptions should not include judgment statements, but objective-striving observations without qualifiers and assumptions around observed behaviors. As a reviewer, descriptions of student experiences are accountable to your knowledge of the field and knowledge of the presented case as part of *JCLEL*'s effort to produce accurate representations situated within the national special education contexts. We ascribe to similar tenets for the review process as *TEACHING Exceptional Children* in which you would be asked to answer the following essential questions for the editor (Weiss, 2015):

1. Does the submission connect to evidence-based practice or an interpretation of relevant law, practice, or policy?
2. Is the manuscript written in a way that is useful to the intended audiences (e.g., teachers in training, teachers in practice, other practitioners and administrators in SPED, researchers, and teacher educators)?
3. Does it represent a unique individual case that adds rich content to the repository?
4. Is the manuscript accountable to those it is designed to represent to the greatest extent possible?
5. Are there representation concerns that should be considered by the DEI council of *JCLEL* for this and future submissions?

There are many reasons to review for *JCLEL* that benefit both reviewers and the fields of study interested in case studies produced by *JCLEL* (e.g., special education, education psychology, speech language pathology). Researchers and faculty of any career status will gain service experience by supporting the development of practitioner/pre-service teacher-focused resources. Review work provides opportunities to shape conversations around topics of expertise and contributes to resources that can support teacher training success. Reviewers can also gain important insights into the experiences of individuals with support needs outside of their personal and professional exposure. But most importantly, reviewers for *JCLEL* help to lift and support underrepresented voices for a national audience to the benefit of all.

GETTING STARTED WITH DIGITAL COMMONS

To become a reviewer for *JCLEL*, anyone who is interested in the case studies can complete an [online form](#) designed to collect basic information. After submitting this form declaring the intention to review, reviewers will receive a confirmation email from the editors. When you are selected as a potential reviewer, you will receive an email from *JCLEL*'s online host, Digital Commons, to complete your confirmation or rejection of the review request, after which you can work towards completing the review. Please watch the video below (or see the transcript) for a walkthrough of the reviewer landing page.

[video - Digital Commons basics for reviewers, Minute 5:00 - 8:10]

https://vimeo.com/43077457?embedded=true&source=vimeo_logo&owner=3414151

INITIAL SCREENING

Manuscripts submitted to *JCLEL* are expected to adhere to our mission, aims, and scope. Specifically, manuscripts should (a) include case student(s) with M-ESN and (b) be grounded in theory, law, public policy, or research (whether to position the case for evaluation against evidence-

based practices or to demonstrate the application of evidence-based practices). In addition, *JCLEL* hopes our journal could be the repository of case studies that “bridge the gap between theory and practice” (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 103). Based on the basic requirements for the quantity of information, quality of writing, authenticity (given the included positionality statement, see description below), and overall fit to the journal, editors will conduct an initial screening. Any manuscript that does not adhere to these basic requirements will not proceed to the further reviewing process.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR *JCLEL* REVIEWERS/EVALUATION CRITERIA

JCLEL publishes five different types of articles, including case study articles (observation- and intervention-based, and multimedia case studies), literature reviews informing case learning, and unique challenges and approaches. Every manuscript type needs to be formatted according to APA style guidelines. Each type of manuscript has different expectations (see How and Why to write for *JCLEL* [Cheek, 2023]), and reviewers will conduct their reviews based on each criterion. In this section, we will review the criteria for each type of manuscript that *JCLEL* reviewers need to consider.

CONFIDENTIALITY

JCLEL editors hold the protection of represented individuals as one of the highest priorities for the journal. Thus, all reviewers should alert the editors to any inconsistencies in representation (e.g., descriptions that contradict in different sections of the case study without explanation), misalignment between the positionality statement and the case description, or any instances where identifying information about an individual or research group is revealed without intent. All types of case studies published require consent and assent when identifiable student experiences are represented, and Institutional Review Board confirmation should be provided for intervention-based case studies.

EVALUATION ACROSS OBSERVATION-BASED, INTERVENTION-BASED, AND MULTIMEDIA CASE STUDIES

JCLEL publishes three different formats of case studies: observation-based, intervention-based, and multimedia case studies. Observation-based case study intends to help readers make data-based informed intervention decisions. Therefore, the observation-based case studies do not include interventions implemented or applicable to the case students. Instead, the case study must provide comprehensive student background information and data that help readers better understand the case student. Given the purpose of this type of case study, at the end of the case study, authors will need to include reflection questions that help readers make data-informed decisions (e.g., IEP goals and interventions). Intervention-based case studies should show how research was conducted and how it applied to the case student, sharing the data and making explicit connections to the research. Comprehensive background information and details of the intervention that were used for the case students in the classroom should be shared. The intervention case studies require wide-ranging information on student background and the specific intervention that shows the association between student learning profile (background information), evaluation findings, and goals and interventions. In other words, intervention-based case studies need to showcase or connect to research with carefully formulated research questions and are informed by the existing literature and a prior appreciation of a gap in the field of special education. They should also include an approach that provides a more informed appreciation of how and why the intervention succeeded or failed. Depending on its purpose, a multimedia case study could follow specific guidelines for either observation- or intervention-based case studies.

We hope that *JCLEL* will produce high-quality case studies that teacher educators can use in preparing special education teacher candidates. To do this, regardless of the submission type, submitted case studies need to demonstrate the complex instructional needs of case students with

details of their learning environments. Case studies published in *JCLEL* are intended to help teacher candidates develop critical thinking skills, problem-solving skills, reflect or take deliberate action, gain familiarity with analysis and action that takes place in complex situations, engage in their learning, and promote the creation of a community of learners (Merseeth, 1996). *JCLEL* believes the consistent and thorough description of the learning experiences of case student(s) makes this possible. Thus, in this section, *JCLEL* provides explicit guidelines for how to review components of each case study type (see Table 1). In other words, reviewers need to consider those components and guidelines while reviewing each type of submitted case study manuscript.

TITLE

The title is intended to help readers predict the primary focus of the case study. Therefore, the title must best represent the individuals described in the case study and include the case student's pseudonym for easy reference. The title should not exceed 15 words.

ABSTRACT

Abstracts are requested with manuscript submission and used to aid *JCLEL* editors and reviewers in the review process. Manuscripts for *JCLEL* focus on authentic case experiences, and abstracts should be similarly focused. In addition to the abstract, keywords are requested in the following areas: case title (e.g., pseudonym of the case student), gender and sex (inclusive of identity or sexual orientation based on relevancy to the case), race (e.g., association and identity markers that position the case), grade band (e.g., pre-school, elementary, middle, high school, post-secondary), dis/ability category (as [described in IDEA](#) or other specifics as relevant to the case), setting (e.g., suburban, urban, rural), context (e.g., inclusive environment, in-school separate setting, home environment), type (observation-based, intervention-based, multimedia, etc.), and focus (the primary topic or source of information of the case study when appropriate).

POSITIONALITY STATEMENT

JCLEL requires authors to include a positionality statement in the submitted case studies. The statement provides an opportunity for authors to aid *JCLEL* in (a) providing transparency of the author(s)'s views/stance toward the individuals described in the case study; (b) increasing opportunity for diverse representation of researched individuals; (c) decentralizing control over individual stories, name inequalities, and reduce inequalities in representation; and (d) providing context to local voices, issues, and identities in an effort to promote equity and inclusion for a national audience. Authors should also use this space to declare any conflicts of interest with a statement describing author-developed intervention strategies, research funding, and any potential benefit to the authors based on this publication. *JCLEL* reviewers should evaluate if the authors clearly state their positions in relation to the individuals described in the case.

- Pseudonyms should be used for participants, schools, and other specific locations, and be in alignment with the participants' preferences whenever relevant.
- Broad geographic locations should be described instead of specific areas (e.g., a middle school in the southeastern United States). Manuscripts describing international areas should provide enough information to ensure the cultural context of the case is communicated but avoid any irrelevant specifics.
- Deliberately misleading information should be used to obscure the identity of case individuals and their protected data if approved by the participants—instances in which the participant information is very rare or unique and may be identifiable. Thus, reviewers should expect authors to exercise additional caution and describe the steps taken to exercise that caution in the positionality statement. Using descriptions of information that are parallel to the real scenario but altered enough to protect the represented individuals is encouraged.

TABLE 1.

REVIEW EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR OBSERVATION- AND INTERVENTION-BASED CASE STUDY

| Reviewer considerations | | Observation-based case study | Intervention-based case study |
|-------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Title | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it best represent the case study? Does it include the case student's name? | ✓ | ✓ |
| Abstract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it effectively summarize the case study? | ✓ | ✓ |
| Positionality Statement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it clarify the author's positions in relation to the individuals in the case? Does it show the authors' effort to keep the confidentiality of the case student's information? | ✓ | ✓ |
| Setting the Stage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it provide a literature-based brief introduction of key concepts and background information that readers need to know to understand that case better? Does it help readers to better understand the context of the case study? (e.g., student age & grade, focus, setting, topics) | ✓ | ✓ |
| Background Information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it describe the following components? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> case student's race, ethnicity, or cultural and linguistic identity? family information (e.g., family members, living environment) for the case student? school information (e.g., classroom environment, peer students, curriculum topic, teacher, paraprofessionals, student placement)? academic and functional/behavioral information on the case student? student preferences (e.g., hobbies, interests, activities)? family preference of child's social or physical development, family resources (e.g., care, transportation), or evening time routines; or family priorities (e.g., transportation for case student access to educational opportunities, job readiness skills, class schedule, class content, and safety for case students)? | ✓ | ✓ |
| Evaluation Findings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it include the case student's disability diagnosis? Does it include case student's evaluation results, including raw assessment data? | ✓ | ✓ |
| Reflection questions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it include questions that guide teacher candidates to discuss teachers' practice or instructional decisions? | ✓ | Optional* |
| Goals and Interventions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it include reasonable IEP goal(s) or post-secondary/transition goal(s) supported by the data in the case studies? Does it suggest potential intervention(s) came up from the goals? Does it align to the given data, IEP goals, and suggested intervention? | N/A | ✓ |
| Discussion/implication | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it include discussion/implication of the case study? Does it include recommendations to teacher educators and teachers? | N/A | ✓ |
| Conclusion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it conclude the case study appropriately? Does it state the case study's relevance to the literature? Does it revisit the direction of future research and limitations? Does it declare the significance of the case study? | ✓ | ✓ |
| References | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it include complete reference lists? Does it use up-to-date references? (e.g., within 10 years) | ✓ | ✓ |

Note. Multimedia case studies follow specific guidelines for the relevant type of case study, either the observation- or intervention-based case study. Reviewers for this type of case study have a high-quality multimedia product, following accessibility requirements (e.g., closed captioning, detailed articulation for the case). Reflection questions for intervention-based case studies are optional, but should authors include them, they should appear at the end of the case study.

SETTING THE STAGE

Setting the stage should help readers prepare to read the case by providing basic context and key case information. This information might be conceptual support for regional or local terminology, processes, or procedures. It might also serve as an introduction to unique or novel topics that readers will encounter in the case. When evaluating the case studies, *JCLEL* reviewers need to evaluate if the case study is supported by current literature whenever appropriate. If an intervention is described in an intervention-based or multimedia case study, the manuscript should briefly detail connections to the literature and supporting evidence-based practices with clarity. In addition, reviewers need to evaluate if this section includes detailed key information about the case student (e.g., age, grade, disability category) and the relevant case context (e.g., setting, focus, or topics) that help readers to interpret the case.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

JCLEL reviewers need to evaluate whether this section provides detailed contextualized information that helps readers better understand the case student and their experiences. Reviewers also need to consider if the given background information is significant to the case and enhances readers' understanding of the case student. Therefore, the information included in this section should set the stage and include cultural and gender identity, race/ethnicity, family and school information, academic and functional/behavioral strengths, areas of needed support, as well as student and family preferences and priorities.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

JCLEL is committed to building a repository of case studies where candidates develop critical analysis and problem-solving, reflect and take deliberate action, gain familiarity with analysis and
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/jclel/vol1/iss1/3>
DOI: 10.20429/jclel.2023.010103

action that takes place in complex situations, engage in their learning, and promote the creation of a community of learners (Merseeth, 1996). To do this, *JCLEL* reviewers need to consider if the case studies include (a) results in alignment with the case student's disability diagnosis; (b) evaluation results, including formal assessment raw data that support the case student's disability diagnosis; and (c) other qualitative data to support the case.

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

This section applies to observation-based and intervention-based case studies, given that observation-based case studies should help readers make data-based informed intervention decisions, and intervention-based case studies should help readers to analyze the application of an intervention. For example, instead of including intervention data at the end of the observation-based case study, authors will need to include reflection questions that help readers make data-informed decisions (e.g., IEP goals and interventions). *JCLEL* reviewers need to evaluate if the submitted case studies include three to five reflection questions that guide teacher candidates to discuss instructional decisions based on the given data. In addition, reviewers need to evaluate whether those reflection questions are pertinent to the given information and if they facilitate problem-solving and critical reflection that teachers need to do during their practice. In the case of intervention-based case studies, the authors can locate those reflection questions at the end of the case study. *JCLEL* reviewers need to determine if those questions facilitate further questions to allow teacher candidates to think broadly about the case.

GOALS AND INTERVENTIONS

This section only applies to intervention-based case studies. Unlike observation-based studies, intervention-based case studies must demonstrate how a research or IEP team proceeds

from decision-making through goals and intervention strategies. In other words, *JCLEL* reviewers need to consider if the submitted intervention-based case studies provide reasonable IEP goals and/or interventions based on the data included in the previous sections. Decision-making would rely on a comparison of the case description to the language and focus of the IEP goals and/or interventions.

DISCUSSIONS/IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

This section only applies to intervention-based case studies. The authors need to discuss how this case study supports the bridge from research to practice with a review of relevant current interventions, the data-based decision-making process of the practitioner, and its intervention effects. *JCLEL* reviewers need to evaluate if the authors provide a more informed appreciation of how and why interventions succeeded or failed. In addition, this section needs to include further recommendations to teacher educators and teachers on moving forward to positive student outcomes based on the case study findings.

CONCLUSION

Reviewers should consider whether the conclusion succinctly affirms the arguments of the manuscript in alignment with the manuscript type. Does it restate the case study's relevance to the literature? Does it articulate why the case study matters? Does it highlight the directions of future research or important limitations?

APPENDICES

Authors may provide additional materials (e.g., evaluation results, lesson materials, templates) at the end of the manuscript as supplemental materials or appendices. Note: these additional materials are included within the total page count for the manuscript. See the *JCLEL* website for specific page numbers related to the type of manuscript submission.

REFERENCES

JCLEL is committed to providing case studies that apply to current classroom practices and student experiences in relation to current best practices. In other words, case studies need to reflect current research, practices, law, and policies. Therefore, *JCLEL* reviewers need to consider the following questions in evaluating reference lists: Does it include complete, up-to-date references in APA style? Does it use relevant and primarily recent (i.e., within 10 years) references to support or contextualize the descriptions in the case?

EVALUATION OF LITERATURE REVIEW

Beyond case studies, *JCLEL* also publishes literature reviews relevant to special education case learning. Like the case studies, these manuscripts should focus on students with moderate to severe disabilities but may be broader in scope to share with readers how their topic informs case learning and future manuscripts for *JCLEL*. If reviewers are not sure if the topic is appropriate for *JCLEL*, they need to consult with the section editor. In this section, *JCLEL* provides explicit guidelines detailing how to review this type of manuscript (see Table 2). Reviewers need to consider the following components and guidelines for evaluation.

TITLE

The title needs to inform readers of the primary focus of the manuscript. Reviewers need to consider if the title best represents the manuscript and if it includes keywords. The title should not exceed 15 words.

ABSTRACT

The abstract plays a role in setting the stage, so it needs to summarize the manuscript effectively. In other words, the abstract must make sense without reading the article. Reviewers need to evaluate if the abstract effectively describes the manuscript by including brief background information, primary findings, and the significance/implications of the article.

INTRODUCTION

The introduction plays a critical role in justifying and positioning the topic of a manuscript. A well-written introduction includes basic information about the topic, a rationale for why it needs to be investigated, and its significance. In addition, the authors need to show how the manuscript's topic is positioned in the existing literature. When assessing the introduction, reviewers should consider the following questions: Does the section introduce the topic appropriately? Does it help the readers get familiar with the topic easily with an appropriate overview of the relevant literature?

LITERATURE REVIEW

JCLEL is flexible with the format of literature reviews. Although it is not required, the authors may use a literature review subheading as a part of the introduction. *JCLEL* reviewers need to consider the following questions: Does it identify the gap in the field? Does it include the claim of significance statement? How will the literature review contribute to the field? Are research questions included?

METHOD

If the manuscript does not have sound reviewing methods in response to research questions and does not describe a specific reviewing process (e.g., not defining variables), the reviewer should detail their concerns in both the body of their review for the authors and to the editors in the optional and informal cover letter. In addition, *JCLEL* reviewers should evaluate if the literature review process is clearly and explicitly documented for readers to replicate the method easily. For example, the process for reviewing the literature needs to describe explicit criteria for inclusion and exclusion, follow the preferred flow for systematic reviews (modeled or modified from Pati & Lorusa, 2018), and report on the process in replicable detail. Common literature review expectations may include the following:

- What are the inclusion/exclusion criteria?
- What search engines, search terms, and processes were used?
- What were the years that were used and is there a rationale for the years chosen to limit the search field?
- What interrater reliability processes and standards were used?
- Was there a coding scheme?

RESULTS

JCLEL reviewers must evaluate if the manuscript provides results that are clearly aligned with the research questions. The key findings need to be organized clearly. Using a table to organize the key information is recommended.

DISCUSSION

The discussion section should include the findings of the literature review, comparing them with the existing literature. In addition, the manuscript needs to discuss how the findings fill the gap identified in the introduction. Potential questions to consider while reviewing may include the following: Does it explain how findings relate to other studies by comparing and contrasting? Does it explain the implications of the practice for the target audience (e.g., potential beneficiaries, allies, and collaborators)? Does it address the limitations of this literature review and implications for future research or case study development?

CONCLUSION

Reviewers should consider whether the conclusion succinctly affirms the findings of the manuscript and is in alignment with the manuscript type. Does it restate the argument's relevance to the literature? Does it explain the directions for future research and limitations? Does it declare the significance of the subject?

TABLE 2.

REVIEW EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR LITERATURE REVIEW AND UNIQUE APPROACHES/ CHALLENGES

| Reviewer Considerations | | Literature Review | Unique Approaches/ Challenges |
|--|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| Title | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it show the primary focus of the manuscript? Does it best represent the case study? | ✓ | ✓ |
| Abstract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it effectively summarize the manuscript topic? | ✓ | ✓ |
| Introduction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the section introduce the topic appropriately? Does it help the readers easily get familiar with the topic with an appropriate overview of the relevant literature and background information? | ✓ | ✓ |
| Literature Review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it identify the gap in the field? Does the literature review provide a rationale for why the study needs to be conducted? At the end of the literature review, does it include research questions and the purpose of the study statement? Does it include the claim of significance statement, or how the literature review will contribute to our field? Does it include research questions? <p>* JCLEL is flexible with the format of the literature review. In other words, the literature review section could be placed under the introduction section or combined.</p> | ✓ | ✓ |
| Method | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it show the literature review process? Is the method replicable? | ✓ | N/A |
| Result | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it provide findings aligned with the research question? Does it present critical findings in straightforward ways? | ✓ | N/A |
| Discussion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it discuss findings, comparing and contrasting with the existing literature? Does it discuss how the literature review result fills the gap in research of case studies for students with moderate to severe disabilities? Does it address its implication to potential interested parties (e.g., teacher educators, researchers, practitioners)? Does it address the limitations of this literature review and future research? | ✓ | N/A |
| Implications/ Directions of practice/next steps (flexible) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it describe the potential challenges of the specific intervention strategies? Does it suggest approaches to improve the challenges? Does it suggest resources that enhance practices? | N/A | ✓ |
| Conclusion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it conclude this manuscript appropriately? Does it state this manuscript's relevance to the literature? Does it revisit the direction for future research and limitations? Does it declare the significance of this manuscript? | ✓ | ✓ |
| References | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does it include complete, up-to-date reference lists? Does it use up-to-date references? (e.g., within 10 years) | ✓ | ✓ |

REFERENCES

JCLEL is committed to providing articles that reflect current research, practices, law, and policies. Therefore, *JCLEL* reviewers need to consider the following questions in evaluating reference lists: Does it include complete, up-to-date reference lists? Does it use up-to-date (i.e., within 10 years) or seminal references?

EVALUATION ON UNIQUE APPROACHES AND CHALLENGES

JCLEL is committed to filling a gap between research and practice for students with moderate and severe disabilities. *Unique approaches and challenges* is a practitioner manuscript intended to share challenging experiences of evidence-based practices (EBPs) in working for our targeting student populations. Despite the available list of EBPs in the field, it can be challenging to observe the intended outcomes for multiple reasons (e.g., controlling research design issues). *JCLEL* hopes to collect and disseminate those challenging stories and share the strategies to advance the field. The following section delineates the considerations for reviewers (see Table 2 also).

TITLE & ABSTRACT

Please see the description for the literature review.

INTRODUCTION

As explained before, the introduction needs to set the stage for the topic. For *unique approaches and challenges*, the introduction must provide readers with basic information about the specific practices of the topic and discuss the significance of the manuscript. When assessing the introduction, *JCLEL* reviewers should consider the following questions: Does the section introduce the targeted EBPs appropriately? Does it provide an overview that helps the reader get familiar with the topic? Does it articulate the significance of the manuscript? How will this manuscript contribute to the field?

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, the authors need to summarize the specific practice based on the literature. *JCLEL* reviewers need to evaluate if the author(s) used relevant literature to inform readers with a sufficient amount of background knowledge on the practice.

CHALLENGES AND DIRECTIONS OF PRACTICES AND NEXT STEPS

This section is the highlight of this type of manuscript. The authors should describe the challenges in implementing the practice and lessons learned, and suggestions to improve the experience. *JCLEL* reviewers need to consider if the information is clearly described to the readers and contributes to locating and using practices for practitioners.

CONCLUSION & REFERENCES

Please see the description under the literature review manuscript.

HOW TO WRITE A REVIEW

We are committed to providing authors with timely service. When you agree to complete a review for *JCLEL*, please ensure that you can conduct a quality review within 21 days of receipt of the email invitation. In the review narrative, you should include an introduction paragraph that conveys your reaction to the fit of the manuscript to the aims and scope of the journal, a statement that describes which specific type of case study or article the manuscript is targeting (e.g., observation-based, intervention-based, multimedia, specific gap in available case studies) and any recommendations for revision.

Please address each section in your narrative, even if it is to praise the authors for their clarity. As you evaluate each section of the manuscript, note that page references for each specific edit will help the authors to address your concerns best. Reviewers should feel free to include a closing sentence to thank the authors for their

work. We encourage our reviewers to bring the total weight of their expertise in APA style, grammar, and any subject area that applies to the manuscript and acknowledge their lack of expertise in the review if they have any. We also encourage reviewers to use a tone that conveys respect for the authors' work despite any shortcomings in the manuscript—we are a community of teachers and learners, and we strive for all authors to feel welcomed.

After completing the manuscript review based on the given considerations above for each type, *JCLEL* reviewers need to decide whether the manuscript's status is accepted with no revision required, accepted with minor revisions, revise and resubmit (with major revisions required), or rejected.

REFERENCES

- Boyle, J. R., & Danforth, S. (2000). *Book cases in special education* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- CLOCKSS. (2022). *Controlled Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe*. <https://clockss.org>
- Georgia Southern. (n.d.). *Georgia Southern Digital Commons*. <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu>
- Davis, G. F. (2014). Editorial essay: Why do we still have journals? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59(2), 193-201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839214534186>
- Haughney, K., & Wakeman, S. (2023). Tempe Wilson: Observation-based case study example. *Journal of Case Learning for Exceptional Learners*, 1(1).
- Kang, J., Haughney, K., & Cheek, A. E. (2022). Case studies on students with IDD and moderate to extensive support needs: A document analysis. *Division for Autism and Developmental Disabilities Online Journal*, 9(1), 101-122. http://www.daddcec.com/uploads/2/5/2/0/2520220/doj_2022.pdf
- Kelly, K. R., Clark, K. A., & Fisher, L. (2023). Teaching employment skills to Carla within inclusive postsecondary education. *Journal of Case Learning for Exceptional Learners*, 1(1).
- O'Leary, Z. (2014). *The essential guide to doing your research project* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Markelz, A. M., & Ridden, B. S. (2022). How and why to write for the journal for special education preparation. *Journal of Special Education Preparation*, 2(1), 6-13. <https://doi.org/10.33043/josep.2.1.6-13>
- Roberts, S. O., Bareket-Shavit, C., Dollins, F. A., Goldie, P. D., & Mortenson, E. (2020). Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(6), 1295-1309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620927709>
- Torres, T., & Barber, C. R. (2017). *Case studies in special education: A social justice perspective*. Charles C Thomas Publications.
- Weishaar, M. K. (2006). *Practical cases in special education for all educators*. Cengage Learning.