

**Subject: Request for article/paper for 'Journal of Training and Development'**

Dear Sir/Madam,

It is our pleasure to inform you that TITI is going to publish a journal titled “**Journal of Training and Development**”. The journal aims to incorporate TVET related research-based articles and innovations in education and training from varied sectors and concerned experts/intellectuals. Hence, we request you to kindly send **article with abstract of 200-250 words** on the related areas by December 15, 2025

The authority to publish the article remains with the Editorial Board. The article/paper approved by the Editorial Board will be sent to the author, if necessary, for incorporating changes as suggested if any. Author/s of approved paper/article will receive an honorarium as per TITI guidelines.

We look forward to receiving your valuable article for the journal. Please send the article either to [4titiofficial@gmail.com](mailto:4titiofficial@gmail.com) or [editorial@titi.org.np](mailto:editorial@titi.org.np).

Please feel free to ask us in case of any query.

With kind regards,

Er. Purushottam Chapagain,

+977-9843238022,

Chief, Research & Development Department, TITI

**Areas related TEVT for article/paper to publish in TITI journal:**

- Instruction and Training
- Curriculum Development
- Education/Training
- Impact Study of Education & Training
- Education Psychology
- IT in education
- Teaching learning evaluation
- Training need analysis
- Management
- Community Devolvement
- Human Resource Development (HRD)
- Institution/Organization Development
- Guidance and Counseling
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Career Development/Entrepreneurship Development
- TEVT policy and planning
- Business/industry/employer's involvement in TEVT
- Labour/Job Market
- Research in TEVT

**Journal Article Publication Process:**

S. No.	Steps	Result	Remarks
1.	Submission (Waiting for Editors first response)	Submitted Successfully (Waiting for Editors First Response)	Once the paper is received, the notification will be sent to the Author.
2.	Primary Acceptance (Plagiarism check pending)	Accepted/Rejected	A notification will be sent to the author/s
3.	Plagiarism Checking (Double Blind Peer Review pending)	Accepted/Rejected (If similarity is less or equal to 15%, the article will be accepted)	If similarity is less or equal to 15%, the article will be accepted. If similarity is less than 25 percent and above 15 % the article will be sent back to the author for revision.
4.	Double Blind Peer Reviewing Reviewer 1 Reviewer 2 (Waiting for the result)	Accepted/Revision Needed as per the given feedback/Rejected	Refer Rubric If one of the two reviewers rejects the paper, the editorial board reserves the right to refer the article to a third person for a final decision.
5.	Final Result	Accepted/Rejected	The Editorial Board reserves the right to accept or reject the paper.

### Rubric for Research Paper

CATEGORY	16-20 points	11-15 points	6-10 points	0-5 points
<b>Relevance</b>  .....Points obtained	Writing is clear and relevant, polished and professional.	Most ideas are stated clearly and are related to the topic,	Many ideas require clarification, are off-topic or have little relevance	Paper does not meet the criteria for the journal publication (too short or incomplete, too long, and/or completely off-topic). <b>Note: “0” points obtained. The editorial board rejects the paper</b>
<b>Cohesiveness</b>  .....Points obtained	Ties together information from all sources. Paper flows from one issue to the next without the need for headings. Author's writing demonstrates an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources.	For the most part, ties together information from all sources. Paper flows with only some disjointedness. Author's writing demonstrates an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources.	Sometimes ties together information from all sources. Paper does not flow - disjointedness is apparent. Author's writing does not demonstrate an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources.	Does not tie together information. Paper does not flow and appears to be created from disparate issues. Headings are necessary to link concepts. Writing does not demonstrate understanding any relationships
<b>Depth of discussion</b>  .....Points obtained	In-depth discussion & elaboration in all sections of the paper.	In-depth discussion & elaboration in most sections of the paper.	The writer has omitted pertinent content or content runs-on excessively. Quotations from others outweigh the writer's own ideas excessively.	Cursory discussion in all the sections of the paper or brief discussion in only a few sections.
<b>Conclusion</b>  .....Points obtained	Excellent summary of thesis argument with concluding ideas that impact reader. Introduces no new information.	Good summary of topic with clear concluding ideas. Introduces no new information.	Basic summary of topic with some final concluding ideas. Introduces no new information.	Lack of summary of topic.
<b>Spelling and grammar</b> .....Points obtained	No spelling &/or grammar mistakes.	Minimal spelling &/or grammar mistakes.	Noticeable spelling & grammar mistakes.	Unacceptable number of spelling and/or grammar mistakes.
<b>Reference, Citation, Images</b> .....Points obtained	Reference, citations and images are properly formatted.	References, citations and images are adequate.	Improper references and/or citations section.	The reference, citations and images sections are missing.

Total points obtained: ..... out of 140. (i.e. .... Percent)

## Reviewers Feedback Report Format

Title of the Research Paper:

Name of the Reviewer:

Date of Submission of the Report:

Category/Criteria for Evaluation	Points Obtained	Minimum requirements	Feedback/Remarks
Relevance		> 6	
Cohesiveness		> 3	
Depth of discussion		> 3	
Conclusion		> 3	
Spelling and grammar		> 3	
Reference, Citation, Images		> 3	
<b>Total Points Obtained</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>The paper cannot be published for &lt; 50 Points</b>

Note: **At least 60 points should be scored for acceptance.**

Reviewer's Comment/Suggestion for publication:

Decision (Tick/Bold only one of the following)	Criteria for Decision	Comment/Suggestion/Justification of the decision
<input type="checkbox"/> The Paper can be published	The article must score > 70 points (50%)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Minor Revision needed	The article must score > 60 points	
<input type="checkbox"/> In-depth revision needed	The article must score $\geq$ 50 points	
<input type="checkbox"/> The paper cannot be published.	< 50 points	