



## AMLE Book Proposal Assessment

**DOCUMENT OVERVIEW:** This template previews criteria that peer reviewers are asked to assess when commenting on the book proposal. Each proposal will include:

- **Publication description:** A brief (500 words or less) overall description of the project, including its subject, scope, and approach. The author should state what is distinctive and compelling about the project.
- **A resume or CV:** Including a one-paragraph biography describing the credentials of the author(s), highlighting relevant experience.
- **Preliminary TOC or Outline:** An outline of the major topics or a detailed preliminary table of contents
- **Schedule for Completion:** Provide a realistic date of delivery of final manuscript to AMLE. Should not exceed 13 months from the date of proposal submission.
- **Writing Sample:** This may include a sample chapter of the proposed work, an article or dissertation that demonstrates the writing style and/or expertise for the proposed work, etc.

Please note that the names of proposers are known to the peer reviewers, but not vice-versa. In other words, you will be participating in a single blind review process, as is common with book publications. The criteria are flexible and interpreted in the light of the specific type and subject of work being provided. Reviewers are asked to submit reviews via an online form; the URL will be mailed to you when we request your assistance.

Once peer reviewers have submitted comments, the CEO draws upon information from the completed forms to reach a publication decision. Once concluded, a publication decision is conveyed to the proposer, with a summarized version of the feedback and selected, representative comments. In the case of works that show some promise, but where the Association is not yet ready to accept a proposal, the editor will work with proposers to suggest specific enhancements or changes, should the Proposer wish to resubmit.

**PEER REVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS:** Neither your individual ratings nor your identity will be shared directly with the author, but aggregate data and comments may be shared, as noted below. When you have completed your review, please submit the form, which will be reviewed by the CEO. (A copy of the response will be emailed to you.)

**Name of Reviewer:**

**Name of Proposer(s):**

**Title of Proposed Book:**

**1. Criterion: Meets professional need of relevance to a core constituency of AMLE's membership (middle grades teachers, administrators, school counselors, support staff, higher education professionals, and prospective educators) (select one)**

Poor: Does not meet a professional need

Fair: Marginally meets a professional need by partially addressing a theoretical or practical problem or challenge

Good: Meets a professional need by addressing a challenge that is common, but less critical

Excellent: Meets a professional need by addressing a critical, broad ranging challenge

Comments (may be shared with proposer):

**2. Criterion: Makes unique contribution to professional discourse (select one)**

Poor: Does not bring forth new knowledge or fill an existing gap in the literature in a relevant or timely topic

Fair: Brings forth new knowledge or partially fills an existing gap in the literature in a somewhat relevant or not particularly timely topic

Good: Brings forth some new knowledge or fills an existing gap in the literature in a relevant or timely topic

Excellent: Brings forth new knowledge or fill an existing gap in the literature in a highly relevant or timely topic

Comments (may be shared with proposer):

**3. Criterion: If a proposal for the Successful Middle School, meets stated aims of series, which include: 1) further expanding on a concept or structure introduced in SMS:TWB, and/or 2) providing implementation guidance for a concept or structure. (select one)**

Poor: Does not meet stated aims

Fair: Meets stated aims partially or in an insufficient fashion

Good: Mainly meets stated aims and could be improved with a few tweaks

Excellent: Wholly meets stated aims and/or does so in a fresh, exciting way.

Comments (may be shared with proposer):

#### **4. Criterion: Author/editor qualifications (select one)**

Poor: Inadequate writing sample provided; difficult to assess expertise in subject area; no evidence that they can manage authoring the proposed text

Fair: adequate writing sample or has some prior publications; demonstrated knowledge of subject area; some evidence that they can manage authoring the proposed text

Good: Record of peer-reviewed publications and/or very good writing sample; demonstrated expertise in subject area; evidence they can manage authoring the proposed text

Excellent: Substantial peer-reviewed publication record and/or excellent writing sample. Proposer may have recognized expertise in subject; has strong writing experience

Comments (may be shared with author):

NOTE: Evidence of ability to author the proposed text may include: a successfully defended dissertation, well-composed articles or other publications, etc.

#### **5. Criterion: Proposal completeness (select one)**

Poor: Poorly developed proposal; major gaps exist; does not comply with proposal template

Fair: Somewhat developed proposal; marginally complies with proposal template

Good: Adequately developed proposal with most necessary information ; substantially complies with proposal template, but some gaps

Excellent: Fully developed proposal with all necessary information; fully complies with proposal template; provides clear scope, realistic timeline; all dependencies identified and addressed e; all dependencies identified and addressed

Comments (may be shared with author):

#### **6. Criterion: Marketability (primary audience—AMLE members) (select one)**

Poor: Perceived demand is low or non-existent

Fair: Perceived demand medium; may not be salable at standard AMLE price points (\$15 – 25); proposed format/design/ length does not enhance appeal

Good: Perceived demand high to medium; salable at standard AMLE price points (\$15 – 25); proposed format/design/ length appealing

Excellent: Perceived demand very high; salable at standard AMLE price points (\$15 – 25); proposed format/design/length highly appealing

Comments (may be shared with author):

**7. Criterion: Contributes to/meets AMLE's Core Values, Mission, and Strategic Plan (see: <https://www.amle.org/amle-at-a-glance/>) and/or its June, 2020 commitment to combatting racism in education (see: <https://www.amle.org/dear-middle-school-community/>).**

Poor: Does not support mission/goals; does not present a good return potential for outlay

Fair: Tangentially supports mission/goals by: a) potentially meeting the evolving needs of membership; and/or b) may be of interest to secondary audience(s); c) may generate return for outlay

Good: Largely supports goals/mission by: a) being a revised edition or translation of a previous work; and/or b) is an opportunity for co-publication with another publishing outlet; and/or c) has some expected return for timely outlay and/or d) partially meets the requirements found in the Excellent category.

Excellent: Fully supports goals/mission by: a) is a new or newly translated academic work on an advanced topic; b) establishes best practice(s); c) new work that needs evolving membership need(s) and/or d) is good value for initial outlay at agreed publication time

Comments (may be shared with author):

**8. Overall publication priority (select one)**

Low

Medium

High

Very High

**Summary Recommendation (select one)**

Accept in current form

Accept with minor revisions (specify below if not noted above)

Revise and resubmit

Reject

**9. Additional comments for the author/suggested revisions**

**10. Other comments/thoughts (NOT to be shared with proposer)**