

Review Procedures for Australasian Humour Studies Network Colloquia Proposals

**(adopted at the Meeting of the AHSN Review Panel Members
Fairfax Meeting Room, The Women's College, University of Sydney
5.45-7.10pm, 14 February 2010, Feast of S. Valentine)**

The annual AHSN Colloquium is designed to operate as a colloquium. It is an interdisciplinary forum for discussion and exchange of ideas. Proposals for papers and workshops are not automatically accepted. The AHSN has a standing Review Panel to cover the range of interests and expertise of the Network and it is the function of Panel members to try and ensure relevance and adequate standards for each Colloquium.

The Panel considers without prejudice all abstracts put before it by the appropriate time and reserves the right to reject a proposal. A rejection is not open to discussion or negotiation.

Each proposal is considered by at least the two members of the Review Committee most relevant to the topic proposed. Should there be a serious discrepancy in judgment, a proposal is automatically considered by a further assessor. The criteria for assessment are: **a) specific or general relevance; b) coherence; c) distinctiveness and d) feasibility.**

Proposals directly relevant to the specified theme of the colloquium will be favoured but all proposals must at least be relevant to the interests of the Network. Coherence requires proposals to have an argument, case study or body of evidence that holds together. It is not code for favouring a specific approach, since Colloquia are intended to stimulate discussion, not impose a "party line". Distinctiveness means that the Panel does not look favourably on accounts of work already familiar to most or many participants, nor on those which lack substance or a basis in a field of knowledge. It welcomes work in progress, but not work that has failed to progress beyond a previous presentation, nor work that is already publicly available. The Panel also considers questions of undue overlap between papers. All proposals must meet constraints of allocated presentation time. **Workshops allow for practical demonstrations of professional work relating to humour, but must include an element of reflection and critique concerning the relations between theory and practice.**

To these ends, Review Panel members are willing to seek clarification about a proposal and may ask for revision and resubmission rather than rejection. It is, however, neither desirable nor possible for the Review Committee to assess formally finished papers nor to blind referee submissions shaped as abstracts or proposals. **The Panel gives special consideration to research students who are undertaking projects relating to humour in their own specific disciplines or beyond.**