



Concordia University Research Chair  
Integrated Design and Sustainability for the Built Environment

**IDEAS-BE Weekly Seminars**  
**Agenda Writing Workshop Series**

Day 1, October 6, 2021 - Bio Sketches

- 1- Welcome (Carmela)
- 2- Write a 500-words or less description of your project, without citations (25 min)
- 3- Sharing of these texts (reading and feedback) (1 hour)
- 4- Forming teams for writing a piece for: The Conversation (15 min)
- 5- Go over rules for The Conversation (see Appendix A; 10 min)
- 6- For next writing workshop, prepare an outline for the 800-word piece (we will write the drafts in the next workshop)

Day 2, November 3, 2021 – Op-Ed Full Draft for The Conversation

1. Welcome (Carmela)
2. Go over peer review tips (10 min)
3. Exchanging 800-word full drafts and peer review in breakout rooms (1hr)
4. Make corrections based on peer review (30 mins)
5. For next writing workshop, finalize the 800-word piece (to be read in the next workshop)

Day 3, December 1, 2021 – Op-Eds Peer Reviews for The Conversation

1. Welcome (Carmela)
2. Presenting the quasi-final op-eds with feedback (1hr)
3. Make final edits (30 min)
4. Celebrate!

## Appendix A

### Rules for The Conversation

The evidence-based nature of the journalism on the Conversation platform is key to our mandate. Please embed hyperlinks throughout your story. These should include links to literature in your field with any additional journalism, government reports or other sources of publicly accessible info.

To add your links, you can:

A) Write your story in the content file (or paste in the raw text). Then highlight the text where you want the link to appear and hit the chain link on the toolbar – you'll see a skinny little horizontal bar for a link will appear. Toggle windows and in your new window find the URL for your link, copy it, toggle back to the story file and paste the link into the horizontal bar.

B) Write your story in Word and add the hyperlinks there, then click on the W on the toolbar in the collaborative story file. This will prompt a window. Paste your text in the window.

If you link to books please link to the publisher (first preference) or Google books, not Amazon. We don't need a Works Cited, a full source list or page numbers as references – ONLY hyperlinks. Simply embed the links through the text in our shared content file. I can't edit your story without hyperlinks.

## Appendix B

### Peer Review - General Tips

Some types of research peer-reviews:

- Journal types
- Original research
- Review article
- Clinical case study/trials
- Critical/opinion
- Book review

Peer-reviewed journals – Scholarly journals are also known as peer-reviewed journals, academic journals, and refereed journals. This refers to the fact that articles in these journals have been subject to a peer review process. The majority of academic journals go through this process. An editorial board asks experts in the subject to review and evaluate all articles that are submitted to protect and maintain the quality and integrity of the journal. This rigorous evaluation process lends legitimacy to the research and therefore, most researchers prefer to publish in peer-reviewed journals.

#### What to look for in General:

- Do you understand the author's research objective (overall aim of work)?
- Does the author make their case effectively with regards to the context, background, and problematic?
- Is the problematic nicely theorized?
- Is the research question clear?
- Does the methodological approach flow nicely from theoretical framework?
- Is it well written and understandable?

#### Report as you find:

- Items you like / don't like.
- Findings that surprised or disappointed you.
- Concepts that were well or poorly presented.
- Anything that confused you.
- Anywhere you feel an example would have helped.
- Anything that contradicted your running expectations.
- Anything unclear, even if later text clarifies it.

#### When you criticize an aspect of a manuscript, offer advice on how to fix it.

- For example, if the presentation is poor, identify why:
- Is the grammar poor?
- Are transitions stunted or awkward?
- Are concepts, definitions and theorems convoluted?
- Are the diagrams unclear?
- Does the author assume too much of the reader's knowledge?
- Are explanations inadequate?
- Are more examples necessary?

#### General guidelines for effective feedback

##### DON'T...

- Recommend additional experiments or unnecessary elements that are out of scope for the work.
- Tell the author exactly how to revise the manuscript—you don't need to do their work for them.
- Use the review to promote your own research or hypotheses.

- Focus on typos and grammar. If the manuscript needs significant editing for language and writing quality, just mention this in your comments.

**DO...**

- Justify your recommendation with concrete evidence and/or specific examples.
- Be specific so the authors know what they need to do to improve.
- Be thorough. This might be the only time you read the manuscript.
- Be professional and respectful. The authors will be reading these comments too.
- Remember to say what you liked about the manuscript!

