

# GGREC Editorial Guidelines

---

## GGREC Editorial Guidelines

### Overlaying criteria for accepting an article

This criteria outlined below must be met, before the sub criteria take effect.

Either one of the below must be met to qualify for further evaluation.

#### Relevance

Is the proposed article of:-

- a technical nature,
- a science subject related to amateur radio, radio or electronics,
- radio operational practice,
- radio historical facts,
- radio general subject of interest e.g.
  - DX expedition, activities of club members, introduction of club member,
  - construction projects.
- GGREC specific club activities or activities of club members
- GGREC club communication by the Committee members about club specifics

and of benefit and interest for the greater club population.

Articles not related to above such as opinion papers about other organisations, clubs or persons will not be accepted.

The duly elected Club Committee will make the final decision to publish or not.

### Further sub criteria when above general rule has been observed:

#### Intellectual property

Would the publication of this content infringe copyright or intellectual property rights? (Sometimes this can be fixed simply by quoting sources of the information.)

#### Quality of Writing

Does the language and imagery include the use of written or visual profanity?

or

Does the article contain sexually explicit content?

or

Is the text excessively complex/technical for a general audience?

or

Does it go on for too long? I.e. Too many pages

and

Is the text of poor readable quality? Sentence structure, punctuation, spelling, etc.

(This is usually reparable by editorial correction without changing the meaning of the text)

If any of these provide a 'Yes' answer, then this should provide adequate cause for rejection.

# GGREC Editorial Guidelines

---

## **Vilification**

Does the article belittle or vilify a specific individual?

## **OR**

Does the article attack or marginalise a gender, a nationality race or religion?

*(To be clear, it is not unreasonable to criticise the actions of an individual or group, as this can be both newsworthy and valid opinion, but an item should not denigrate the identity of an individual person or group)*

## **ACCURACY**

Can the content be demonstrated to be a falsehood, or an unsubstantiated allegation?

*(Here the onus is upon the editorial team to prove that something is a falsehood and be able to support that claim with evidence of their own. Suspicion of falsehood is not evidence of a falsehood.)*

Where evidence of accuracy has not been supplied by the author, it may be appropriate to add the word 'allegedly' to a claim, but it is *inappropriate* to add 'allegedly' where substantiated evidence has been supplied by the author. It is reasonable for the editor to ask an author for more information to substantiate any particular claim.

The Club editor should be able to make judgement directly using the above criteria almost all of the time, but where they are unsure, or desire a second opinion, they should defer to two or more committee members for confirmation.

## **APPROPRIATENESS**

Does the article contravene the policies or aims of the Club and is it in the best interest of the Club to publish it? Is the article / letter provocative in nature.

**Ultimately,**

**it is the Committee's decision to publish or not to publish an article / letter.**