

Teacher Education Advancement Network (TEAN) Journal

Author Submission Guidelines

The Teacher Education Advancement Network (TEAN) is a professional learning community for teacher educators across the UK, Europe and beyond. In using the term 'teacher educator' we mean to include all those professionals who have a significant formal role in initial teacher education or in the provision of continuing professional development for experienced teachers. Such teacher educators may be based in university departments, colleges, schools, early years settings or be working as education consultants.

The TEAN journal is a peer reviewed open access journal focused on advancing research and scholarship in teacher education. The audience is primarily teacher educators but also includes teachers, school-based professional development leads, school senior leaders, professional educators in other fields, researchers into teacher education, researchers into higher education, and policy makers.

The TEAN journal is available open access online at:

<http://www.cumbria.ac.uk/Courses/SubjectAreas/Education/Research/TEAN/TEANJournal.aspx>

The ISSN of the journal is: **2054-5266**

1. Format

The TEAN journal publishes two broad types of paper which should be a maximum of 6000 words (not including the abstract and list of references). All papers include an abstract of up to 200 words without acronyms or citations.

Research Papers: these focus on developing theory and practice in teacher education through analysis of empirical data or systematic review of published research. The journal welcomes research papers from a wide range of relevant disciplines, methodologies and paradigms including action research and practitioner research.

Evaluation of Practice Papers: in these papers the authors will demonstrate how their critical evaluation of practice has informed new understanding, strategies or approaches in teacher education and development. In some cases these are empirical studies but are more pragmatic than systematic research projects; however they must be underpinned by advanced scholarship, meaning critical engagement with the literature to inform the evaluation and position its findings.

2. Anonymous peer review

An anonymised version of each submitted paper is scrutinised by two peer reviewers. The journal aims to provide supportive feedback and the feedback from reviewers and editors will provide ways in which to improve your paper even if it is not accepted for publication in the journal. Reviewers are asked to critically evaluate the paper and the project underpinning it but also to respect the author(s) and their work and use sensible and supportive language in their feedback.

Reviewers will comment against each of the following prompts:

- Is the title clear and relevant?
- What is the main focus of the paper and is it relevant to TEAN?
- What are the strengths of the paper and of the research / evaluation?
- How might the paper be improved? Are there any major problems?
- Are there problems with citation and referencing that require action?

and make a recommendation as follows:

- The paper should be accepted for publication subject to minor revisions
- The paper should be accepted for publication subject to major revisions
- The paper should be rejected

3. Submitting your paper

Formal submissions of papers for peer review and consideration for publication is completed by online submission. Prior to formal submission, if you wish to have an abstract or draft paper considered informally by an editor for brief comment then send it as an email attachment to the assistant editor, Linda Shore at linda.shore@cumbria.ac.uk

Prior to online submission please check your script against the author guidance set out in section 5 below before submitting it to the journal. This will save a good deal of work for the editorial team and for you as the author.

Please note: If your paper is accepted for publication, it is assumed that you agree to the article also being published on the TEAN journal website and also placed in the University of Cumbria's digital repository 'Insight'.

4. Amending your paper

If your paper is accepted subject to revisions then it is important that you minimise the time and cost for the peer reviewers and editors by detailing carefully your response to the feedback and the amendments that you have made.

At the top of the text in your resubmission insert a table, as below. Down the left-hand column summarise the feedback comments from reviewers and editors with one issue per row. For each issue in the feedback use the centre column to briefly describe the amendments you have made to the paper (or explain your reasons for not changing your text). Use the right-hand column give the page number and paragraph number (from the top of the page) of your amendments in the revised version of the paper. Use red ink for sections of text in your amended version of the paper where you have made significant changes or added new text in response to review comments.

Summarised comments from the reviewers / editors	Amendments made to the revised version of the paper	Page numbers and paragraph numbers (with significant changes in red ink)
Reviewer comment 1		
Reviewer comment 2		
etc		

5. Guidance

The TEAN journal publishes two broad types of paper which should be a maximum of 6000 words (not including the abstract and list of references).

The title should be concise (up to 140 characters) and aim to capture the focus of the paper and some indication, if possible, of the main finding(s).

All papers include an abstract of up to 200 words without acronyms or citations.

Reference lists should not be excessively long and authors are asked to cite only work that is directly relevant to their argument.

Papers should be aimed at an international audience. Use Plain English and avoid unnecessary acronyms or excessive local detail. Give clear signals within the text and use side headings to help clarify the structure and argument of the paper for the reader.

The Harvard system should be used. See the exemplar references in the next section. Only those sources cited within the paper should be provided as references in alphabetical order of authors at the end of the paper. Citation and referencing needs to be accurate and complete.

You must include a clear statement about ethical approval obtained for your project; for example, this may have been gained through an institutional ethical approval process. You should also explain how the key ethical risks were mediated.

Diagrams and illustrations will only be accepted where the editor is convinced that they add considerable value to your paper. In this case, consider carefully the font size required within the diagram and use an existing copy of the journal to estimate the constraints. Any photographs, tables, charts or diagrams should be numbered as Figure 1, Figure 2 etc. in the order to which they are referred. The chart or diagram must be ready for reproduction without retouching and all lettering, graph lines and points must be sufficiently large and bold to permit reproduction when the diagram has been reduced to a size suitable for inclusion in the publication.

6. Template for submitted papers

Page 1:

Author names and affiliations

Title (Calibri 11)

Abstract

Maximum of 200 words, no citations (Calibri 11)

Keywords

Up to six keywords (Calibri 11)

Page 2 onwards:

Title (Calibri 11)

Introduction (Calibri 11 bold)

Main body of text (Calibri 11)

Other side headings (Calibri 11 bold)

Use side-headings as appropriate (Calibri 11)

Acknowledgements

You may wish to acknowledge funding agencies (Calibri 11)

References

You should only include texts that are cited in your paper and these should include all forms of publication including websites. Please list in alphabetical order by first author's surname. Even working within Harvard the punctuation of references does vary, please see the example reference list below and follow the conventions used.

- Case, S.M. and Swanson, D.B. (2002) *Constructing test questions for the basic and clinical sciences*. Available at: www.nbme.org/publications/item-writing-manual.html (Accessed: December 2006).
- Clegg, K. and Bryan, C. (2006) Reflections, rationales and realities, in Bryan, C. and Clegg, K.(ed.) *Innovative Assessment in Higher Education*. London: Routledge. pp. 216-227.
- Cowan, J. (2010b) Virtual relationships - behind a veil?, *Academic Identities for the 21st Century: the 2nd international conference*. Glasgow: University of Strathclyde, 16-18 June. Glasgow: Centre for Academic Practice and Learning Enhancement.
- Dill, D.D. (1999) 'Academic accountability and university adaptation: the architecture of an academic learning organisation', *Higher Education*, 38(2), pp.127-154.
- Disability Rights Commission (2002) *Code of practice for providers of post-16 education and relevant services*. Stratford upon Avon: DRC.
- Dunn, L., Morgan, C., O'Reilly, M and Parry, S. (2004) *The Student Assessment Handbook: New directions in traditional and on-line assessment*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Gibbs, G. (2010) *Using Assessment to Support Student Learning*. Available at: <https://portal.uea.ac.uk/documents/6207125/8588523/using-assessment-to-support-student-learning.pdf> (Accessed: 17 October 2019).