MONASH University

Ed Creely <edwin.creely@monash.edu>

[epaa] Could you review a MS for Education Policy Analysis Archives? ("The (In)Coherence of Canadian Refugee Education Policy with the United Nations' Strategy")

1 message

Danah Henriksen <danah.henriksen@asu.edu>   14 July 2021 at 03:13
To: "Dr. Edwin Creely" <edwin.creely@monash.edu>

Dear Dr. Edwin Creely,

I am writing to ask if you would review a manuscript for education policy analysis archives by 07-30-2021. You can get to the review webpage directly with the following URL:

https://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/reviewer/submission/10783?key=3E2dKNRQ

The submission's abstract is inserted below this paragraph.

"The (In)Coherence of Canadian Refugee Education Policy with the United Nations' Strategy"

Abstract
This study assesses the coherence of Canada's educational policy regime with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' (UNHCR) Refugee Education 2030 strategy. We articulate a theoretical framework that combines theories about policy coherence, policy attributes, and policy tools, which informs a two-phase methodology. First, we conducted jurisdiction-based scoping reviews of policies in Canada's 13 provinces and territories which have constitutional authority over education. This yielded a sample of 155 documents, which we then analyzed for its vertical coherence with Refugee Education 2030. Our analysis focused on five categories of need in the UNHCR strategy with respect to refugee students, namely access to education, accelerated education, language education, mental health and psychosocial support, and special education. The findings reveal there are policies across Canada that target responses to the five categories of need. Although some policies are exemplary in their coherence with Refugee Education 2030, Canada's refugee education policy regime is characterized by many inconsistencies and significant gaps. Policymakers in Canada could use the specific findings to develop or revise policies to address shortcomings. Researchers and policymakers in other countries who find value in our approach could replicate the study's method in their own jurisdictions, using the instruments provided in appendices to identify strengths and gaps.

If you agree to review this manuscript, I trust that you will follow the normal professional guidelines of reviewers to provide constructive, substantive feedback and to consider this manuscript as a confidential and privileged document during the review process. An example of written guidelines for reviewers is in the 7th edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (pp. 378-79).

Please head to the review URL above (or log into the EPAA review website with your username) to indicate whether you will undertake the review or not, as well as to access the submission and to record your review and recommendation.

Whether you have a username and password or not, you can use the following link to reset a password (which will then be emailed to you along with your username):

https://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/login/resetPassword/ecreely?confirm=a199358bf10699d3f9a62d3b7ccf0d
61522a47416bd233f2e8d131846fab1b5d%3A1626203534.

But you can always use the direct link to the review page:

https://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/reviewer/submission/10783?key=3E2dKNRQ

Reviewers always provide an important perspective for editors, and I hope you will find time to help with this manuscript. I would greatly appreciate hearing quickly whether you can accommodate my request. If you agree to review this article, you should keep this e-mail so you can click on the direct link to the review page. Regardless of whether you can review this manuscript, I also welcome recommendations and contact information for others you think would be good reviewers, and I wish you the best for your writing and work.

Sincerely,
Danah Henriksen
Arizona State University
danah.henriksen@asu.edu