

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CREATIONISM



Technical Review Process, Overview and Procedures

Sponsored by:

Creation Science Fellowship, Inc.
P.O. Box 99303
Pittsburgh, PA 15233-4303
(412) 341-4908



and

Institute for Creation Research
P.O. Box 2667
El Cajon, CA 92021
(619) 448 0900



Table of Contents

1. Purpose and Scope of the ICC Technical Review Manual	3
2. Technical Review Process Overview and Infrastructure.	3
3. The Role of the CSF Board of Directors and ICR Administrative Council.	3
4. The Role of ICC Coordinator.	3
5. The Role of the EB Chairman.	3
6. The Role of the Proceedings Editor.	4
7. The Role of and Procedures for the Area-Editors.	4
8. Summary Review	4
9. Appeal Review	6
10. The Role of and Procedures for the ICC Area-Editor.	7
10.1. Upon receiving the Summary from the EB Chairman	7
10.2. Upon the reception of the Author's first draft	8
10.3. Upon the reception of the Referee Evaluations	8
10.4. Upon the reception of the Author's final draft.....	8
10.5. Upon an appeal of the Editor's rejection of paper.....	9
11. Resolving Conflicts of Interest.....	9
11.1. Conflicts at the EB Chairman Level	9
11.2. Conflicts at the Area-Editor Level	9
12. APPENDIX 1 (Area-Editor's Summary Evaluation Process).....	10
13. APPENDIX 2 (Area-Editor's Summary Evaluation Form)	11
14. APPENDIX 3 (Referee's Evaluation Process).....	13
15. APPENDIX 4 (Referee's Evaluation Form)	14
16. APPENDIX 5 (A Generic ICC Call for Papers).....	16
17. APPENDIX 6 (Example Acceptance / Rejection Letters)	18
18. APPENDIX 7 (ICC Infrastructure)	20

1. Purpose and Scope of the ICC Technical Review Manual.

The purpose of this “manual” is multifold:

- (1) Articulate the details of the ICC Peer-Review process
- (2) Define the ICC Editorial Board Chairman’s responsibilities
- (3) Define the ICC Editor’s responsibilities
- (4) Provide a mechanism for the resolution of conflicts
- (5) Show Authors as to how their papers will be assessed

The scope of this “handbook” is to detail the ICC Peer-Review, and does not address the specifics of formatting and paper mechanical details.

2. Technical Review Process Overview and Infrastructure.

The technical review process of the International Conference on Creationism (ICC) has been designed to ensure the quality of the papers at ICC and to provide guidance to its authors. The body responsible for this process is the ICC’s Editorial Board (EB). Appendix 7 illustrates the ICC Infrastructure. The Editorial Board consists of the Chairman, who is also the Proceedings Editor, and the Area-Editors.

3. The Role of the CSF Board of Directors and ICR Administrative Council.

The Board of Directors of the Creation Science Fellowship, Inc. (CSF) and the Administrative Council of the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) have the overall sponsorship and financial responsibilities of the ICCs. All activities are ultimately under the oversight of the Board of Directors of CSF and the Administrative Council of ICR. The Creation Science Fellowship, Inc., is a 501-3(c), non-profit, educational organization in the state of Pennsylvania, while ICR is similarly a 501-3(c), non-profit, educational organization in the state of California.

4. The Role of ICC Coordinator.

The role of the ICC Coordinator is to liaise with EB Chairman to keep track of the authors’ progress so that coordination duties and statistics are known. The Coordinator with the EB Chairman work together to determine the number of papers ultimately received into the ICC. This defines the number of presentations, rooms, and schedule at the Conference.

5. The Role of the EB Chairman.

The role of the EB Chairman is to supervise the review and preparation of the technical content of the ICCs. The EB Chairman is responsible for the overall flow and process of the technical review, including the editors, and reviewers. He works closely with both the ICC Coordinator, and is the Proceedings Editor. He oversees all activities of the technical review process and presides over the appeal procedure casting the final vote in the event of a tie. See appeal procedure below. He has the responsibility of representing the EB to the CSF Board and ICR Administrative Council.

6. The Role of the Proceedings Editor.

The Proceedings Editor has the responsibility of bringing the Conference Proceedings to print. As the EB Chairman he also works closely with the Area-Editors to ensure the Proceedings reflect the ICC, that the proper papers are included, and that all final corrections have been incorporated. He is responsible for maintaining deadlines with the authors and the production of the Proceedings volume.

7. The Role of and Procedures for the Area-Editors.

The Area-Editors along with the EB Chairman constitute the ICC's Editorial Board. The Area-Editors work with the authors and referees in the ICC review process. The Area-Editor's specific responsibilities include:

1. The review of each summary received into their areas (see Summary Review) and recommendation to the EB Chairman of acceptance or rejection.
2. Receive from authors the papers assigned to their area and send each paper to a minimum of three (3) reviewers.
3. Receive the reviews and then work with the authors to improve and finalise their papers.

8. Summary Review

Upon the reception of the Summary the Area-Editor is to follow the following procedures:

- 1. Receive and log the Author's Summary (approximately 500 words).**
- 2. Review the Summary for possible inclusion into the review process.**

The following criteria are to be used in judging the summaries:

- (a) Does the Author provide a complete classification of this Summary (Area)? If the Summary is not properly classified, the Area-Editor is to classify it within another area, then the initial Area-Editor is to contact the appropriate Area-Editor for its inclusion. If unable to classify a Summary, then the EB Chairman is to be consulted for the final decision. (If a Summary is impossible to classify then it ought to be rejected or returned to the Author for resubmission).
- (b) Is the Summary's topic important to the development of the creation model?
- (c) Does the Summary's topic provide an original contribution to the creation model?
- (d) Is this Summary formulated within a young-earth, young-universe framework?
- (e) If (d) above is not satisfied, does this Summary offer a very constructively-positive criticism and provide a possible young-earth, young-universe alternative?
- (f) If the Summary is polemical in nature, does it deal with a topic rarely discussed within the origins debate?
- (g) Does this Summary provide evidence of faithfulness to the grammatico-historical/normative interpretation of Scripture? (if necessary refer to Walsh, R.E., Biblical Hermeneutics and Creation, Proceedings First International

Conference on Creationism, Creation Science Fellowship, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA, 1986, Vol. 1, pp. 121-127).

Remark:

Do not be afraid to reject a Summary if it does not properly satisfy the above criteria nor is in the best interests of the ICC as judged by its goals as outlined in the Call for Papers (see Appendix 5). The ICC Area-Editors play a very important initial role in preserving a high level of quality in the ICC, as well as protecting the ICC from unnecessary review on clearly inappropriate papers.

Time Frame:

The Area-Editor ought to have completed his/her review within three (3) weeks of the receipt of the Summary.

Notification:

For each approved Summary the Area-Editor must then inform the EB Chairman and Proceedings Editor of each Summary's status so that he can contact the Author. This is to also ensure that for a given Author the maximum number of three (3) allowable entries is not exceeded.

3. Notify the EB Chairman and ICC Proceedings Editor about the Summary's status (acceptance or rejection). In the case of Summary acceptance, include the Area, Author's name, address, phone number, and e-mail address. This notification of the EB Chairman should be by way of e-mail.

4. Correspondence with the Author.

(a) Upon rejection of the Summary in Present Form (see enclosed example). The EB Chairman is to inform the Author in writing that the Summary is rejected in its present form. Included in this letter must be:

- (i)** The stated reasons for rejection.
- (ii)** Suggested areas of improvement should the Author choose to resubmit the Summary.
- (iii)** Encouragement to the Author for future research and involvement with the ICCs.
- (iv)** If appropriate, the EB Chairman can suggest with recommended improvements other sources for publication (i.e., CRSQ, Creation Magazine, CSF Newsletter, Creation Ex-Nihilo Technical Journal, Origins, and other European Journals, etc.).

In all correspondence, the EB Chairman and Area-Editors must keep in mind that they are the ICC representatives and should be as honorable, forthright, and kind in ALL dealings with the Authors. This correspondence with the Author will be copied to the relevant Area-Editor so he/she is aware if the Author subsequently corresponds with him/her.

(b) Upon acceptance of the Summary (see enclosed example). The EB Chairman is to inform BOTH the Author and assigned Area-Editor in writing of the preliminary acceptance of the Summary. The respective correspondence must include:

(i) Author Correspondence

- A statement on the preliminary nature of this acceptance. (This means the Summary has been placed into the ICC peer-review process and that final approval of the subsequent paper is solely the responsibility of the Area-Editor.)
- The Summary's assigned area and Area-Editor, including the Area-Editor's name, address, e-mail address. (No phone numbers of the editors are to be given out by the ICC EB Chairman unless prior approval is given. Let the Area-Editor give his/her phone number out on his/her own accord.)
- Encouragement to the Author for working closely, submissively, and positively with his/her Area-Editor. (Indicate the importance of working closely with his/her ICC Area-Editor—to better ensure the paper's final acceptance and frankly the best possible paper.)
- If possible include any technical advice to aid the Author in improving the Summary's subject. (This might include: recommended reading [papers, books, etc.] and items that ought to be covered in the paper, as supplied by the Area-Editor to the EB Chairman with his/her review of the Summary.)
- A complete ICC Instructions to Authors manual. (Remind the Author to study the Author's manual, strongly encouraging him/her to pay close attention to the required mechanical details of the papers.)

(ii) Area-Editor's Correspondence

- A copy of the Author's Summary. (This is absolutely necessary for the Area-Editor to recruit the proper referees prior to receiving the first draft of the Author's paper.)
- A copy of the EB Chairman's preliminary acceptance correspondence with the Author. (This is to indicate any advice the EB Chairman may have given the Author to improve the intended subject of his/her Summary. Do NOT include the Instructions to Authors manual in the Area-Editor's correspondence.)

5. Keep ALL evaluations and correspondence for each Author/Summary. This is for (1) to establish a history of the submission, (2) for further documentation in the unlikely event of an Author appeal of the Area-Editor's rejection of final paper.

6. Contacting EB Chairman. In the case of an unsure assessment, the Area-Editors are encouraged to contact the EB Chairman for further discussion.

9. Appeal Review

In the event that an Author feels that his/her paper has been treated prejudicially or unfairly by his/her Area-Editor and/or Referees, that Author may contest an editorial decision. Because

of the confidence implicit by the CSF Board of Directors and the ICR Administrative Council in the expertise and deduction of the ICC Editors and their Referees, the burden in each such case is OVERWHELMINGLY on the Author to prove that his/her paper has been treated prejudicially or unfairly. The following is a detailed description of the Appeal Review Process.

1. If the Author wishes to pursue the matter, the Author must inform his/her Area-Editor and the EB Chairman in writing outlining the specifics of his/her objections to the decision against the paper. This must be done ASAP to insure against ICC deadlines.
2. Immediately upon the reception of the Author's letter of appeal, the Area-Editor is to submit a copy of all correspondence related to the paper, including Referee evaluations and Area-Editor's assessment of the appeal, to the EB Chairman.
3. Immediately upon the reception of the Area-Editor's package (#2 above), the EB Chairman will assess the matter consulting with the Area-Editor and Author if possible.
4. The EB Chairman has the authority to only affirm the Area-Editor's decision.
5. In the event that the EB Chairman is unable to concur with the Area-Editor, he is to select four other Area-Editors, two from the same theme as the paper, and two from other conference themes. Together with the EB Chairman they will form an Appeal Committee to evaluate the matter. The EB Chairman will chair and vote on this Appeal Committee.
6. This Appeal Committee will then cast their votes to either uphold or overturn the Area-Editor's decision.
7. Upon the final decision the EB Chairman is to inform both the Author and Area-Editor of the final decision.

It is hoped that this somewhat "bureaucratic" process will maintain the integrity and quality of the ICCs. Note that "quality and speed" are crucial in this process because of Proceedings publishing deadlines.

10. The Role of and Procedures for the ICC Area-Editor.

The ICC Area-Editors are the load-bearing elements in the ICC peer-review process. The importance of the ICC Area-Editor's role cannot be overstated. Except in the rare case of an Author appealing the ICC Editorial decision, the ICC Area-Editor holds full authority of a paper's acceptance into the ICC. Even in the unlikely event of appeal, the OVERWHELMING burden of proof rests upon the shoulders of the Author. The responsibilities of the ICC Area-Editors include:

1. Collect for each Summary a host of referees for its paper review process.
2. Based upon the paper's reviews, help the Author in bringing his/her paper to acceptance.
3. Provide the final acceptance or rejection of the Author's paper.
4. In the event of an Author appeal, provide the EB Chairman with all of the Area-Editor/Author/Referee correspondence of the rejected paper.

10.1. Upon receiving the Summary from the EB Chairman

1. Gather at least three Referees (possibly including the Area-Editor), competent in the

area of each paper. Competent creationists are to be sought first, if available; but if not available, then competent non-creationists are to be used, in which case the Area-Editor is to exercise discernment in separating out evolutionary bias from legitimate criticisms of a paper. Though not required, each Area-Editor is advised to get evolutionary criticism on each paper regardless of whether sufficient qualified creationists were available for review.

2. Notify the EB Chairman of your recommendation of acceptance or rejection of the Summary, along with any suggestions for reading (books, papers) to improve the proposed paper. The EB Chairman will then notify the Author of the Summary of its reception and encourage him/her to work closely with you, reminding the Author of deadlines and paper formatting as detailed in the ICC Instructions to Authors Manual, along with your technical advice and suggestions. You should also then make contact with the Author and may wish to request that the Author immediately submit a list of suggested Referees.

10.2. Upon the reception of the Author's first draft

1. Send the Author's first draft and a Referee's Evaluation Form to the appropriate Referees, indicating to them that their review ought to be received in a timely fashion, emphasizing the importance of providing a bibliography.
2. Insist that the Referees use the Referee's Evaluation Form (as supplied by the Area-Editor), particularly Part III asking for additional literature from the Referee.
3. Keep the paper's Author anonymous to the Referees.

10.3. Upon the reception of the Referee Evaluations

1. Based upon the evaluations from the Referees, work with the Author to improve his/her paper: Provide specific critiques and areas of improvements.
2. If necessary, setup intermediate deadlines between you and the Author for future drafts of paper. These deadlines must ensure that the final deadline be met so that the ICC Proceedings Editor has sufficient time to edit all of the papers into the Proceedings to be available at the Conference. See 10.4.3 below.

10.4. Upon the reception of the Author's final draft

1. Notify the Author of Acceptance / Rejection of paper.
2. Notify the EB Chairman and ICC Proceedings Editor of the paper's final status.
3. This must be done in a timely fashion such that the Area-Editor can send the final draft to the ICC Proceedings Editor by the final deadline (see the Call for Papers in Appendix 5).
4. Maintain complete files on each paper for at least 4 years.
5. Provide the EB Chairman the names of the Referees used for each paper. This information is to be confidential.

10.5 Upon an appeal of the Area-Editor's rejection of paper

1. Submit all correspondence related to the paper to the EB Chairman.
2. To ensure publishing deadlines the correspondence of (1) above must follow immediately upon the reception of the Author's appeal letter. Because of the implicit confidence in the expertise of the ICC Area-Editors, a rather "bureaucratic" procedure has been put into place to assess and to properly protect the EB Chairman's decision. See Appeal Review.

11. Resolving Conflicts of Interest

When receiving summaries and papers, invariably there may arise conflicts of interest among the evaluation team (Editors, Referees, etc.). This section outlines a methodology for handling such conflicts.

11.1. Conflicts at the EB Chairman Level

1. In the event that the EB Chairman believes that the appropriate Area-Editor is unable to fairly judge a summary due to personal or professional reasons, he ought to select another Area-Editor for that summary.
2. In the event that the EB Chairman believes that the assigned Area-Editor might have a conflict of interest with the Author or paper, the EB Chairman ought to discuss the matter with the other Area-Editors within the conference theme outlining his reasons for a possible conflict of interest.
 - (a) If after this discussion, it is clear a conflict exists, then that summary/paper is to be assigned to a different Area-Editor. This decision is to be transparent to the Editor(s).
 - (b) If after this discussion it is unclear that a conflict exists, then the EB Chairman is to contact the intended Area-Editor and discuss the matter. Upon the conclusion of this discussion appropriate action is taken by the EB Chairman.

11.2. Conflicts at the Area-Editor Level

1. In the event that an Area-Editor believes he or she is unable to fairly access an assigned paper, he or she is to return all materials to his EB Chairman and that Author will be reassigned to another Area-Editor.
2. The Area-Editor should be cognizant of possible conflicts of interest when selecting Referees for papers. Though it is an impossible task to be totally impartial when human nature is involved, the Referees ought to be selected primarily for their expertise in the particular area.

12. APPENDIX 1 (Summary Evaluation Process)
Evaluation Process
International Conference on Creationism

Area-Editor's Evaluation Process

Indicate your evaluation with respect to the criteria of Part I below by marking an "X" on the provided scales, noting the meaning of the labels underneath these scales and their associated numerical value. The following table illustrates the Summary Evaluation classification and associated numerical values.

ABBREVIATION	DESCRIPTION	EVALUATION VALUE (e)
SA	Strongly Agree	5
A	Agree	4
U	Undecided	3
D	Disagree	2
SD	Strongly Disagree	1
NA	Not Applicable	No value assigned

"Not Applicable" (NA) should be used if the specific criterion does not apply to the topic of the Summary.

To aid in "quantifying" the Summary's evaluation, the numerical values in the table above are to be used in determining the Summary's Evaluation Number (SEV). Do not include a criterion in the calculation if it has received an "NA". As a rule, the Summary's SEV should be greater than or equal to 3 for inclusion into the Technical Peer Review Process and passed to the EB Chairman.

The SEV is nothing more than the average of the criteria above (not including the NA classifications). If required, Area-Editors are encouraged to use intermediate scores (i.e., between A and U => 3.4) in evaluating Summaries. The following equation is to be used for calculating the Summary's Evaluation Value (SEV).

$$SEV = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k v_i}{k}$$

Where:

k = The number of applicable criteria (those not equal to NA).

Example:

The following table illustrates an example of a Summary Evaluation (see Summary Evaluation Form).

CRITERION	CLASSIFICATION	EVALUATION VALUE
1	A	4
2	U	3
3	D	2
4	U	3
5	NA	-
6	D	2
7	SA	5

Evaluation Results:

$$SEV = (4 + 3 + 2 + 3 + 2 + 5) / 6$$

[3.167] SEV

[X] Accepted

[] Rejected

13. **APPENDIX 2 (Area-Editor's Summary Evaluation Form)**
Summary Evaluation Form (Page 1 of 2)
International Conference on Creationism

(I) **Classification and Evaluation**

(A) Title of Summary:

(B) **Main** Author's Name:

(C) Your classification of the theme and area (see 0(1) above)—you may need to give more than one theme and/or area:

(1) Is the topic of this Summary important to the development of the creation model?

SA A U D SD NA

(2) Does the topic of this Summary provide an original contribution to the creation model?

SA A U D SD NA

(3) Is the topic of this Summary formulated within a young-earth, young-universe framework?

SA A U D SD NA

(4) If #3 above is not satisfied, does this Summary offer a constructively-positive criticism providing a young-earth, young-universe alternative. (This item may be difficult to determine from only the Summary. In this case, if the Summary is considered for acceptance, then the EB Chairman ought to emphasize that this requirement must be included in the final paper. This admonishment is to be in the initial Summary's acceptance correspondence from the EB Chairman.)

SA A U D SD NA

(5) If the topic of this Summary is polemical in nature, does it deal with an issue(s) rarely discussed in the origins debate?

SA A U D SD NA

(6) Does this Summary provide evidence of faithfulness to the grammatico-historical/normative interpretation of Scripture?

SA A U D SD NA

(7) Is this Summary in the best interests of the ICCs.

SA A U D SD NA

Evaluation Results:

SEV Accepted Rejected

Area-Editor's Summary Evaluation *Form* (Page 2 of 2)
International Conference on Creationism

Optional Advice:

(II) **Area-Editor's Recommendation (attach extra sheets if necessary).**

(III) **Area-Editor's Bibliography for Part II (attach extra sheets if necessary).**

**14. APPENDIX 3 (Referee's Evaluation Process)
Referee's Evaluation Process
International Conference on Creationism**

(0) Preliminary Comments

The importance of your role as a Referee for the International Conference on Creationism (ICC) can hardly be overstated. The Referees, in conjunction with their Editors, are shouldering the lion's share of maintaining both the quality and the fairness of the ICCs. We are to deal a just weight and just measure (Lev. 19:36), for we also have an Evaluator in Heaven (Eph 6:9; Col 3:24–4:1).

Your Editor will probably use more than one Referee to evaluate the paper in question, and generally the Editor will make the final decision based on yours, his, and the other Referees' evaluations. The one possible exception to this is if the Author appeals in accordance with a specified due process in which the overwhelming burden of proof is on the Author.

The form below is intended as a tool for you to convey information in an organized fashion to your Editor. Please note the following:

- (1) Indicate your detailed classification of the paper in Part I according to the enclosed ICC "CALL FOR PAPERS" (see Appendix 5).
- (2) Indicate your evaluation with respect to the criteria of Part I by marking an "X" on the provided scales, noting the meaning of the labels underneath these scales:

SA	=	Strongly Agree
A	=	Agree
U	=	Undecided
D	=	Disagree
SD	=	Strongly Disagree
NA	=	Not Applicable

"Not Applicable" (NA) should be used if the specific criterion does not apply to the paper or discipline in question. If required, you are encouraged to use intermediate values (i.e., between A and U).

- (3) Part II is where you indicate your final recommendation; and this is where issues not cataloged in Part I are to be addressed, or issues raised in Part I are dealt with more fully. Your recommendation can be:
 - (1) Acceptance of the paper as submitted.
 - (2) Acceptance of the paper subject to certain revisions which you should specify in detail.
 - (3) Rejection of the paper. This means the paper is unacceptable to the degree that reasonable revision within a reasonable length of time (2–4 months) cannot render it acceptable.This form, or whatever summary of it the Editor deems appropriate, will be sent anonymously to the Author; and whatever your evaluation, your purpose is to help the Author.
- (4) Part III is where you give the bibliography of your evaluation, particularly your remarks and recommendations of Part II.

15. APPENDIX 4 (Referee's Evaluation Form)
Referee's Evaluation Form (Page 1 of 2)
International Conference on Creationism

(I) Classification and Preliminary Evaluation

- (1) Title of paper (to be filled out by the Area-Editor):
- (2) Your classification of the theme and area (see 0(1) above)—you may need to give more than one theme and/or area:
- (3) This paper makes an original contribution to the Creation Model (see 0(2) above):
 SA A U D SD NA
- (4) This paper is well-documented (with respect to the relevant literature):
 SA A U D SD NA
- (5) This paper has considered alternative explanations:
 SA A U D SD NA
- (6) This paper demonstrates an awareness of its own limitations:
 SA A U D SD NA
- (7) This paper provides a basis for further work in its area or related area:
 SA A U D SD NA
- (8) This paper exhibits sound methodology:
 SA A U D SD NA
- (9) This paper demonstrates proper use of material and equipment:
 SA A U D SD NA
- (10) This paper properly presents sufficient data to address its stated aims:
 SA A U D SD NA
- (11) This paper properly interprets its data:
 SA A U D SD NA
- (12) This paper properly develops and uses its mathematical models:
 SA A U D SD NA
- (13) This paper's mathematical models are applied to the appropriate and/or important examples:
 SA A U D SD NA
- (14) This paper is tightly and coherently reasoned:
 SA A U D SD NA
- (15) This paper is faithful to the grammatico-historical / normative interpretation of Scripture:
 SA A U D SD NA

Referee's Evaluation *Form* (Page 2 of 2)
International Conference on Creationism

(II) Referee's Recommendation (See 0(3) above, and attach extra sheets if necessary).

(III) Referee's Bibliography for Part II (See 0(4) above and attach extra sheets if necessary).

16. APPENDIX 5 (A Generic ICC Call for Papers)

International Conference on Creationism

Call for Papers

Sponsored by:

Creation Science Fellowship, Inc.
P.O. Box 99303
Pittsburgh, PA 15233-4303

and

Institute for Creation Research
P.O. Box 2667
El Cajon, CA 92021

CALL FOR PAPERS

High quality papers for the **Sixth International Conference on Creationism** (ICC), are now invited for submission. In continuation of the ICC theme, the theme of this ICC is again **Developing and Systematizing the Creation Model of Origins**, making this ICC a "working" conference.

The interested author should write a 500 word abstract of his/her paper, categorize it according to the area classification below, and submit a copy **no later than 31 October 2006** as an attached Word file to an email to the Editorial Board Chairman (address provided below). Early submission is highly recommended.

Each submitted abstract will be evaluated by the Editorial Board Chairman in consultation with the Area-Editors responsible for the technical review process for possible inclusion into the review process. If accepted, the author will be sent an email from the Editorial Board Chairman **no later than 31 December 2006** detailing acceptance of his/her paper and the Area-Editor to whom his/her paper has been assigned, along with the Technical Review Process Overview and Procedures and Instructions to Authors documents dealing with the review process and the format of ICC papers respectively as attached files. The author will then submit his/her paper to the designated Area-Editor **no later than 30 June 2007**. The Area-Editors will then send each paper to referees, work with the author to improve his/her paper, and have final jurisdiction over the acceptance or rejection of each such paper. Final drafts of all papers, including any revisions, are to be in the Area-Editor's hands **no later than 31 January 2008**. (These dates are firm!)

Papers dealing with the age of the earth/universe must be from a young-earth perspective. Papers from an old-earth/old-universe perspective will not be considered.

The Conference theme is partitioned into major themes, and each theme is divided into areas overseen by Area-Editors.

AREA CLASSIFICATION

Theme I FOUNDATIONS OF SCIENCE

Areas:

- (1) Biblical Models and Hermeneutics
- (2) Mathematical and Logical Models
- (3) Philosophy of Science

Theme II LIFE SCIENCES

Areas:

- (1) Cell and Molecular Biology
- (2) Organismal Biology
- (3) Biogeography
- (4) Systematics
- (5) Genetics
- (6) Ecology

Theme III STELLAR AND PLANETARY SCIENCES

Areas:

- (1) Astro-chronometry
- (2) Cosmogony and Cosmology
- (3) Atmospheric Science
- (4) Hydrospheric Science
- (5) Cryospheric Science

Theme IV EARTH SCIENCES

Areas:

- (1) Geochemistry and Geochronology
- (2) Geophysics
- (3) Physical Geology
- (4) Sedimentary Geology
- (5) Paleontology

Theme V SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE HUMANITIES

Areas:

- (1) Philosophy of History
- (2) Linguistics
- (3) Archeology
- (4) Psychology
- (5) Economics and Political Science
- (6) Education

17. APPENDIX 6 (Example Acceptance / Rejection Letters for EB Chairman)

Name
Address
Date

Dr. _____
Address

Dear Dr. _____:

On behalf of the Editorial Board of the International Conference on Creationism (ICC), I would like to thank you for the submission of the your Summary entitled, SUMMARY TITLE.

Upon review of your Summary, the Editorial Board has decided to include it into the ICC peer-review process. Please keep in mind that this is a preliminary acceptance of the Summary. The final acceptance of your paper is solely the responsibility of you and your ICC Editor. Please work very carefully and closely with your ICC Editor; he is there to help you and make you paper as best as possible.

In your paper you may wish to include a discussion on the fauna of the Sahara Desert (see Pink, A.W., Fauna of the Sahara Desert, Journal of Practical Biology, 1985, Vol.1, pp. 122-145).

Your Summary has been classified into the Life Science - Biogeography Area. Your ICC Editor is:

Appropriate Editor's Name
Address
E-mail

To better ensure the final acceptance of your paper, I strongly encourage you to work closely with your Editor. He is there to help and aid you in creating the best possible paper. **Pay very close attention to the details and deadlines detailed in the attached Instructions to Authors manual.** This Author's manual provides the details of your paper formatting, author instructions, ICC presentation requirements, and articulates the appropriate deadlines. Please pay very close attention to the deadlines.

Let me extend my congratulations, and I look forward to seeing you at the International Conference on Creationism.

Sincerely,

Editorial Board Chairman

Enclosures:

cc:
Author's Editor

Name
Address
Date

Dr. _____
Address

Dear Dr. _____:

On behalf of the Editorial Board of the International Conference on Creationism (ICC), I would like to thank you for the submission of the your Summary entitled, SUMMARY TITLE.

Upon review of your Summary, the Editorial Board has decided not to include it into the ICC peer-review process. Since the Summary is polemical in nature the Editorial Board believes that its topic is not sufficiently new to provide an original approach to the topic. You may wish to resubmit the Summary with the following additions: (1) include in the main paper a detailed mathematical analysis on the rate of decay of the radioactive material will be provided (this analysis has not yet been examined), and (2) provide a serious discussion on alternative versions of this model.

I wish to extend my encouragement to you regarding your efforts for the furtherance of our understanding of the Creation Model of Origins. If you choose not to resubmit your Summary to the ICC at this time, you may wish to submit your Summary (with suggested modifications) to other Creation Publications.

Again, thank you for your interest in the ICCs and I look forward to hearing from you at the next ICC.

Sincerely,

Editorial Board Chairman

APPENDIX 7 (ICC Infrastructure)

Technical Review Process Infrastructure

