

Guidelines for Content Editors of KKHSOU

The University deserves the right to change the rules and procedures described in this Programme Guide. Please check from time to time with the University Website for updates



**Krishna Kanta Handiqui State Open
University**



Guidelines

for

Content Editors of KKHSOU

1. Content editing is an integral part of SLM development process in Open Universities. The SLM Units may be written by diverse writers. The main responsibility of the Content Editor is to bring a cohesion in the Units for imparting the value added benefits to the learners, a major segment of them is normally from rural and remote areas.

2. The Content Editors of the SLM units should be thorough with the guidelines the University has provided to the SLM writers. The guidelines may be accessed at the following link

***** (would be provided after uploading of guidelines for SLM writers)

3. The Content Editors should primarily look for whether the SLM writers have complied with the guidelines or not. The concerned course coordinator of KKHSOU will first see the compliance aspects before assigning the task of editing to the Content Editors. The Content Editors, being the Subject Experts would primarily look for matters related with academic aspects of presenting the contents to the learners.

4. As per our experience, timely submission of edited contents of six/seven units of SLM should not take more than thirty days of time. The Content editors should strive for timely submission of SLM units, else the University will face the problem of progressive delays in the subsequent processes of SLM development. Editing of the contents should be all-inclusive as per the guidelines of SLM writing. In case of serious inadequacies in respect of editing the SLM, the University may reject the Editor's report or may reduce the amount of payment. That question will never arise if the Content Editors see the Units from the learners' perspectives and make necessary modifications in the SLM Units. In case of serious lapse and major modification, the Content Editor may suggest cancellation of the Unit and recommend rewriting. The University, therefore, requests the Content Editor to undertake further editing of a completely or substantially re-written unit, until the same is of publishable quality.

5. Based on the review of the units, the Content Editors should mention feedback on the following criteria as per the format below:

SLM Course Title:

Table 1: Editorial Evaluation of the Units

Sl. No	Criteria of Evaluation	Concerned Units (Please indicate numbers of the Units as may be applicable)
1	Units have been written as per syllabus.	
2	Previous knowledge have been linked up.	
3	Inter-relation and cohesion between/among the units have been observed.	
4	Languages of the units are not clear. Needs further re-writing.	
5	Conceptual clarity is not found. Needs further re-writing.	
6	Unit(s) need plagiarism checking.	
7	Substantial contents from Internet has been observed.	
8	Unit(s) are not at all publishable.	
9	Authors of these units may be engaged in future.	
10	Authors of units who should be paid full amount for writing.	

Table 2: Editorial tasks undertaken

Sl. No	Editorial tasks	Units (Please indicate numbers of the Units as may be applicable)	Suggested for Revision (Please indicate numbers of the Units as may be applicable)
1	Units needed minor editing.		
2	Inter-relation and cohesion between/among the units have been made.		
3	Units needed moderate editing.		
4	Significant revision/writing needed.		

Name of the Editor :

Signature :

Date :