

## ***LTSN Project***

### **A Student Internet Journal**

D J Raine

Final Report 28/01/02

#### **Background**

The aim of the project was to develop a module in which fourth year students ran a 'scientific journal' which 'published' their peer-reviewed work. A feature of the project was that the journal should be published electronically as an internet journal. The module was based on a pilot project in the previous year which had been purely paper-based.

#### **Implementation**

The initial issue of the journal (called the Journal of Special Topics or JST) contains short articles and letters which implicitly suggest further work. There are also review papers, where necessary, to remind students of relevant specialist background material and hence to act as prompts to lines of investigation. This material is provided by academic staff, the development of which was partly funded by the project. Seven members of staff provided material in three areas, astronomy, space science and pure physics corresponding to the three MPhys degree streams offered by the Department. (The name of the journal derives from the emphasis on specialist areas.)

The initial issue is published on the web using the commercial software WebBoard which is installed on the University network. Instructions for use of WebBoard are also published here. The organisation, instructions for use and preparation of the web material was funded by the project and carried out by a postgraduate student.

Instructions to students on the structure of the course were prepared. They are attached here as appendices.

Tutorial notes for supervisory staff were also provided, containing possible solutions to the suggested problems, data sheets that might be requested and attendance sheets, together with a timetable and schedule. Supervision and tutorial support was shared between 5 staff, with the project leader having overall control of the web publishing (in effect acting as publisher).

Assessment is based on peer review (the refereeing process and the inclusion of names on papers) and submission rates with only an overview requirement for academic judgement provided by the publisher as described below.

#### **Programme**

Students work in groups of 3 to 5 on a two-week cycle.

In week 1 they work on material of choice in issue 1 of the journal. Groups were allowed to choose subjects freely although the expectation was that they would choose their specialist areas. Groups submit 'papers' which are no more than one page solutions, or more usually partial solutions, in the suggested problem areas. Groups are permitted to submit self-initiated material provided it is not directly related to course work. They may also suggest observations or experiments to obtain more data, which are treated and peer reviewed in the same way as papers. Papers are submitted for review by posting them on the appropriate journal section on the web.

At the start of week 2 the editorial board for this cycle (a subset of students, approximately one from each group) organises the distribution of papers for review. In week 2 groups review papers and submit referee reports via e-mail to the editor (appointed by me).

Finally for this cycle, the editorial board meets to accept papers or return them for reconsideration.

Published papers are designated as such by moving them to the designated area of the journal. Additional papers by staff are added to provide new material or develop submitted work and the cycle starts again.

There were four cycles in this implementation of the module.

### Evaluation Procedure

The module was evaluated by a general meeting between two members of staff (including myself) and the whole student group. The meeting lasted about 1 hour 30 minutes.

### Evaluation Results

The use of the internet was not entirely successful. While it allowed students to view submitted work immediately, it was also necessary to print out material to work on it. It is not efficient or economic for students to print multiple copies. Future implementation will require the printing to be organised in a structured manner so that each student can receive the relevant material as required.

The quantity of material also overwhelmed the publishing process. At the time of writing not all accepted papers have yet been moved to the appropriate section and designated as such. An improved method is required to track revised versions of papers (especially where revisions include changes of title and where the content is not discernable from the file name).

In contrast to the pilot project where groups submitted approximately 1.5 papers per cycle, in this session the number was closer to 4, usually shorter, papers. This was also too large for the refereeing process (there should be two referee groups for each paper, but this proved impossibly onerous towards the end). A much larger fraction of papers were rejected with rather superficial refereeing. The standard of published papers fell well below that of the pilot project.

The editorial meeting was too large. This was partly a function of the record number of MPhys students which will solve itself in the next few years. However, consideration should be given to forming editorial boards for *each* of the specialist areas of the journal (with a member of staff assigned to each).

In the pilot project, members of academic staff were present for three hours on a Thursday afternoon to help groups work on papers and on refereeing. This was introduced to limit the time spent on the module to the intended 150 hours. However, at times the sessions felt a bit like a 'school detention'. As a result of feedback from the pilot project, the procedure was changed to a flexible session on Thursday afternoons (which in practice usually lasted less than an hour) with further work to be organised by the students (with staff available for consultation if required). This worked well in principle - students worked sensibly - except that the absence of staff input was clearly apparent in the lower standard of achievement in the accepted papers. We need something intermediate between these extremes. The availability of paper copies of papers to work from immediately will help.

In the pilot project groups were initially assigned topics to work on to prevent too much overlap. In this version a free choice was allowed. The former was too rigid - some groups worked on no more than one or two problems - and the latter too flexible. (I never want to read another attempt to calculate the temperature of Jupiter.) In this environment the requirement of 'originality' for acceptability of papers was too contentious to implement rigorously.

Students suggested that there should be more examples of acceptable papers and referees reports. This would overcome the problem that reports were often not written in a suitable style (despite instructions). Training sessions in the writing of referees reports and on common mistakes of English use were provided midway through the module: these should be given at the start.

Complaints that referees had misunderstood papers were common. This was regarded as bringing realism to the module.

In addition, I would have to say that the use of the web and a student editorial board did not reduce the excessive staff time required to produce the journal. (Much of this spent in trying to track papers can be avoided by a better system, but I also put a lot of time into extensive editing of papers to demonstrate correct use of English and style. This latter therefore may be unavoidable; if so it should be distributed amongst more staff, the opportunity for which would arise naturally from the splitting of the editorial board.)

Despite these problems of detail the module was judged an overall success with a number of points made:

Students felt they had learnt how science 'works' (and many who were not going on to PhDs would not otherwise have known this). They expressed a preference for this approach over a more conventional course on scientific research.

The experience was generally enjoyable and the suggestion that this was an appropriate way of embedding basic knowledge was readily agreed (but not volunteered without prompting). The length of the module was agreed to be about right.

The best unsolicited compliment was paid by one of the students who is staying on to do a PhD who has requested that he be allowed to assist with the teaching of the module next year because he 'thought it was such a good idea and had enjoyed it so much'.

### Futher Developments

Additional material has been obtained from academic staff so that it is not necessary to repeat the module content year by year.

The journal structure has been changed to contain three sections (Physics, Space and Astrophysics) with an editorial board for each.

Submitted papers now require a code which identifies the group and sequence number

The introductory session includes a briefing on what is expected for papers and referee reports with examples, and a discussion of common errors of presentation.

Groups are instructed which paper to start on for week 1. Thereafter they will have a free choice.

The scheduling has been changed so that new papers now appear on the web on Mondays to give time for student preparation before the Thursday meeting with staff

The scheduling has been relaxed somewhat at the start to allow more time for familiarisation

Referees reports are no longer confidential and are posted as replies to the original postings of articles, as are revised papers (compare *InterJournal*).

The Thursday afternoon sessions are scheduled for 1 ½ hours.

Corrections in the English of papers are still made by the editor on a paper-by-paper basis and identified to the groups concerned.

### Dissemination

The way WebBoard operates requires a password for access, and requires users to be registered computer users of the University of Leicester. It is not possible therefore to grant general access. A user name and password can be made available through the project leader to anyone requiring access for a specific purpose.

The project leader gave a presentation on the project at the Physics Discipline Network Meeting in Leeds in September 2001. It was included in a talk I gave on problem based learning at Dublin City University in May 2001 and will be included in a talk on Independent Learning to be given in Loughborough in December 2001. An article on Independent Learning has been commissioned from the author for the Journal of Biological and Physical Chemistry.

### Appendices

Appendix 1 Module description

Appendix 2 Revised Instructions to Staff and Schedule

Appendix 3 Contents of JST Vol2 Issue 1 (2000)

Appendix 4 User Guide

## Physics and Astronomy Course Outline

- **Title: SPECIAL TOPICS**

- **Module Information Summary**

Course code:	PA498	Module codes:	PA498	Lectures:	1
Credits:	10	Prerequisite modules		Classes:	
Semester:	1	Lecturers	CN, SWC,GAW	Workshops:	8

- **Aims and Objectives:**

To continue a development of the general physics course into the fourth year in order to

- i) to reinforce core subject knowledge and professional skills
- ii) develop team work

- **Outline:**

Students organised in groups of about 4 (in degree flavours)

Groups are given an initial problem in the form of a mock scientific paper .

*Note: These papers are short (1/2 to 1 page) accounts of a problem or reports of data. Roughly speaking they can be thought of as corresponding to individual general physics questions.*

Groups work on the 'published' data or problems and produce one or more

(a) bids for further observations or data

*The bids are short - one paragraph applications specifying what data is required with some justification. This would correspond roughly to the data supplied with the general physics questions*

(b) submissions of a paper

*Again a short piece that corresponds roughly to handing in the answer to part of a general physics question.*

Bids and papers are given to other groups to referee. They respond with a report detailing errors (and corrections), or acceptance

Accepted bids result in supply of data to the group. Accepted papers are published to the year as a whole at regular intervals.

*Note that staff also publish unsolicited data and papers to help things along or to provide more things to do as necessary.*

The objective is to publish as many papers and get as many grants as possible

### **Timetable (8 weeks)**

- Week 1 Induction meeting (1 hour) timetabled
- Wednesday: papers published. This gives some time for preparation.
- Thursday (odd weeks): Afternoon timetabled sessions to work on problems.
- Monday morning: submission of papers and bids. This allows some further work, but not a whole week.
- Thursdays (even weeks) Afternoon timetabled session to work on refereeing.

- **Assessment:**

**Assessment:** Marks for submission (1), publication (2-4), publication of errata (1), submission of referee reports(1) Students to keep and submit CV of publications and contributions. There is no examination.

---

**Special Topics Revised Instructions**

Staff Notes

The feedback session with students last year showed widespread understanding and support for what we are trying to do. There were however some (a lot of) detailed suggestions for improvements. As a result I propose that we adopt the following arrangements. **Please check that they make sense.** I suggest we have a **brief meeting** possibly shortly before I see students at 2.30 on 5 Oct, say at 2.00pm (unless you think there might be problems, in which case let me know.)

Meeting with students Friday 5 Oct 2.30 F2 (DJR to induct students; it might be useful for staff to attend as well)

- Students sign up for groups
- Introduction to webboard and handout of examples
- Election of three student editors for the three streams for issue 1 (Subsequent editorial duties in rotation through each cycle)
- Students directed to begin – papers (in hard copy) assigned to groups

Monday 8 – Thursday 11 Oct. Students read papers published on webboard and start work on papers. The first paper to be worked on is assigned; thereafter a free choice.

Thursday 11 Oct 2.30-3.00 F2 Students meet to start work  
3.00 – 4.30 Meeting with staff and students to supervise work

Monday 15 Oct midday Deadline for submission of papers (by posting to webboard) for issue 2. Papers must carry the group identifier in the file title. Students begin consideration of papers (to see which they would like to referee)

Thursday 18 Oct 2.30 – 3.00 LRC!!! Editorial board meets to ensure each submission has at least one referee (preferably two, depending on numbers of submissions) Each group should seek to referee 3 papers per issue.  
3.00 – 4.30 LRC!!! Meeting with staff to work on referee reports.

Monday 22 Oct Midday Deadline for referees reports (Later postings will be ignored for assessment purposes) These **MUST** be posted as **replies** to the relevant papers using webboard. Editorial board meetings/student editors to decide on accepted papers (i.e those where the referees have recommended no changes). Inform staff editor of accepted papers. Papers checked by staff editor and okayed for publication (information to DJR by paper identifier, not title and authors).  
Staff editors to keep a record of submissions, reports and acceptances, plus a note of any papers, which in their opinion should receive less than 3 (full) marks, or reports that should receive less than 1 (full) mark. (Accepted papers receive 3 marks unless there is some reason otherwise.)

Monday 22 Oct – Thursday 25 Oct Students prepare responses to reports

Thursday 25 Oct 3.00-4.30 Issue 2 published. (= new staff papers plus those accepted without revision).

Staff help students work on responses to referees reports and/or new papers. (New papers if they have nothing else to do!)

Monday 29 Oct Midday Deadline for submission of revised papers and new papers for issue 3.

Monday 29 Oct – Thursday 1 Nov Students start work on new papers.

Thursday 1 Nov 2.30-3.00 Editorial boards assign referees for issue 3. Staff help with work on new papers.

Monday 5 Nov Midday Deadline for submission of papers for issue 4. Students start work on refereeing for issues 3 and 4

Thursday 8 Nov Editorial board assign referees for Issue 4. Help with refereeing for issue 3.

Monday 12 Nov Deadline for refereeing. Editor's acceptances for Issue 3 notified

Thursday 15 Nov Issue 3 published. Editorial board consider referees reports. Students work on responses or new papers with staff help

Monday 20 Nov Submission of revised papers for issue 4.

Monday 20 –Thursday 22 Nov Refereeing

Thursday 22 Nov Editorial board checks referees. Help with refereeing

Monday 26 Nov Deadline for all referees reports

Thursday 29 Nov Editorial board consider reports. Help with resubmissions Final resubmissions assessed by staff for publication in issue 4.

### **Differences from previous years:**

Minor scheduling changes

Public publication of referees reports as attachments to papers and resubmissions as attachments to aid tracking.

Availability of print cards to allow printouts in advance of meetings (I hope)

Preparation time for Thursday meeting. Slightly longer scheduled meeting (1.5 hours) with two staff (at least) present (as before).

Three students editorial boards per cycle– one for each degree stream- and 3 staff editors, to reduce time pressures and work overload (on me).

Staff editors will need to be present at editorial board meetings for guidance if necessary (not just me). .

Staff editors to check accepted papers (not me) and advise me. Arrange with editors whether by e-mail or hard copy.

Derek 28/01/2002

## Journal of Special Topics

### **Vol 2 Part 1 Contents**

Letter: Extended H-beta Emission (Derek Raine) 09/10/2000  
Correspondence: Comets get a dusting down (Derek Raine) 09/10/2000  
Review Article: Cometary Tales (Derek Raine) 09/10/2000  
Letter: A Galaxy Cluster in X-rays (Derek Raine) 20/09/2000  
Letter: X-ray Structure Determination (Derek Raine) 20/09/2000  
Review Article: Magnetic Moons (Derek Raine) 20/09/2000  
Review Article: Similarity Solutions (Derek Raine) 20/09/2000  
Review Article: Radiative Processes (Derek Raine) 20/09/2000  
Review Article: A Second Look at HII Regions (Derek Raine) 20/09/2000  
Letter: A New Old Star Cluster (Derek Raine) 20/09/2000  
Review Article: The Ion Tails of Comets (Derek Raine) 20/09/2000  
Review Article : Extinction of the Dinosaurs (Derek Raine) 06/09/2000  
Review Article : Heating of the Atmosphere by the (Derek Raine) 06/09/2000  
Correspondence: Induced Dipoles (Derek Raine) 06/09/2000  
Correspondence: Saving the Earth (Derek Raine) 06/09/2000  
Correspondence: Satellite Data for Climate Forcast (Derek Raine) 06/09/2000  
Correspondence: Solar Gravity Power? (Derek Raine) 31/08/2000  
Letter : Photon Beams (Derek Raine) 31/08/2000  
Review Article : Star Clusters (Derek Raine) 31/08/2000  
  
User Guide (Derek Raine) 31/08/2000

Note: The above is copied directly from WebBoard. WebBoard records the person posting the topic, not the author, hence the attribution of my name to all the papers which were provided by various members of staff. for this issue.

# Journal of Special Topics – User’s Guide

## 1. Introduction

The Journal of Special topics is an Internet Journal hosted by a conferencing facility called WebBoard. This allows users to read or post messages and files that either start a new topic or add to a topic that currently exists.

## 2. Logging in

Use your web browser to open the page

<http://webboard2.le.ac.uk/~physics/>

or follow the links from the fourth year course page. This will launch the log-in screen :



You will have been assigned a username and password. Type them in and click on **Log In**.

Note that it is not possible to log in as a guest or a new user with our WebBoard.

## 3. Conferences

The screen is split into two sides :



The left-hand panel shows the available ‘conferences’:

- Journal of Special Topics Vol. 3 Part 1 (20, 20 New)
- Journal of Special Topics Vol. 3 Part 2 (0)
- Journal of Special Topics Vol. 3 Part 3 (0)

Journal of Special Topics Vol. 3 Part 4 (0)  
JST Submissions and Refereeing (Physics Section) (0)  
JST Submissions and Refereeing (Astrophysics Section) (0)  
JST Submissions and Refereeing (Space Section) (0)  
JST Archive (0)

These are the parts of the **Journal of Special Topics** and the various sections of **JST Submissions and Refereeing** and the JST Archive. To **view** the topics in a conference, click on the **+** symbol next to the title. You can now click on the topic or message you need and it will appear in the right-hand window.

### 3.1 Journal of Special Topics Vol 3 Part 1

This is the first issue of the journal this year. (Vol 3 refers to the fact that this is the third year of running the journal.) Individual topics can be viewed by clicking on their title. They are all in the Microsoft Word .doc format. You can download the file to your home directory to read or print by clicking on its name. Some of the files are Review articles, while others are Letters to the Editor. There is also a template article file that you can download and use to write your own articles. You are **not** allowed to **post** articles to this conference.

### 3.2 JST Submissions and Refereeing

This is where you post your work and gain interactive feedback from other users. You must post your articles and referee reports to the appropriate section (space, astrophysics, physics) depending on the subject matter (anything that is not space or astrophysics is physics) If you are posting a message or file associated with an *existing topic* (for example, a revised version of an article or a referees report) you must use the **Reply** option rather than the **Post** option (see below).

## 4. Posting a message

### 4.1 New Topic

Click on the conference name and then click **Post**. You will see the frame alongside.

Give your message a **name** (see below for how to do this) in the top box and then enter your message in the large box below. If you have attached an article then it is useful for other users if you copy here the abstract or a short one line description of the topic.

You will often need to attach a file as part of your message. If this is the case then check the **Attach File** box before clicking on **Post**. The message is spell-checked and the system prompts you with a preview. If you are happy with the message, click **Post** and it will appear on the conference within a few seconds.

Do not send messages anonymously. Note that the senders of all messages, while not necessarily known to users, are known to the board manager.

### 4.2 Replying to a message

When a message is being read in the right-hand window there is a standard toolbar across the top:

[Post](#) | [Reply](#) | [Reply/Quote](#) | [Email Reply](#) | [Delete](#) | [Edit](#)  
[Previous](#) | [Next](#) | [Previous Topic](#) | [Next Topic](#) | [Entire Topic](#)

There are three reply options:

**Reply** - Straight reply to any message (The one you use)

**Reply/Quote** - Includes the original message (Not normally necessary)

**Email Reply** - Sends private email to the message author (for use by the board manager)







### 4.3 File Attachments

Having checked the **Attach File** box and clicked **Post**, the following screen appears:

### Attach a File to "Test posting with file attachment"

**NOTE:** Your browser must support file uploading. If you don't see a "Browse..." button below, your browser does not support form-based file uploading. Netscape 2.0 and later have this support.

Choose a Category:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
					
Application	Audio	Document	Image	Multimedia	Unknown

File to upload:  Browse...

File description:

Upload another?  Yes  No

[Help](#) | [Cancel](#)

Check the box which corresponds to the type of file, e.g. **Document**. Click on **Browse** and select the file to be sent. Click **Upload Now** and then **Post**.

## 5. Editing messages

This can only be done by the conference manager or the person who posted the message. Amendments are made by reading the message and then clicking either **Edit** or **Delete**.

Do not edit a paper once it has been posted. You can submit as many revised versions appropriately labeled as you wish. The labels will track which version has been refereed.

## 6. Identifying files and submissions

The **name** of your topic and the **file name** of any attachment **MUST** carry a group identifier and sequence number. The **group identifier** is the group of the first author. (Groups will be labeled as A1, S1, P1, A2,...etc.) The **sequence number** is the count of papers published by that group. Thus the first paper submitted by group S1 might be S1\_1\_Asteroids with the file attachment S1\_1\_Asteroids.doc. Note the sequence number counts all papers submitted, not just those under a given topic (i.e. a sequence number once used is never repeated). File attachments for revised articles should be labeled by a **version number** e.g. S1\_1\_Asteroids\_v2.doc (Attachments without a version number will be taken as v1 !)

Referees reports must be submitted as replies to the corresponding posting with first line consisting of the refereeing group identifier followed by R (to identify a report) followed by the identifier of the paper being refereed e.g.

S2R\_S1\_1\_Asteroids (with the names of those contributing if not the whole group). If the report is submitted as an attachment (e.g. if it needs to contain mathematical formulae) the file should be labeled accordingly. (In this case S2R\_S1\_1\_Asteroids.doc.)

*It is in your own interest to follow these rules. When it comes to the assessment markers will not spend time hunting around for submissions. Only those properly identified will be marked.*

## **6. Online Help (for WebBoard)**

Just click on the **HELP** button on the WebBoard toolbar.

## **7. Submissions**

The journal contains

- (i) **review articles** written by staff (only). These are intended to be helpful guides to suitable topics. **Students do not write review articles**
- (ii) **articles** (or 'papers') submitted by student groups or staff. These are submissions that generally contain one or more points but are no more than one page in total. Staff papers are published as required to stimulate thought. To distinguish these papers from review articles they are called **Letters**. (See the Journal *Nature* for example)
- (iii) **correspondence** usually submitted by staff, consisting usually of a single paragraph with no more than a single equation, these make a single, often paradoxical point.
- (iv) reasoned **requests for data** (i.e. 'research grant proposals'). For the purpose of this simulation these are treated as ordinary papers leading, if accepted, to publication of the *data* in the journal.

## Example student paper

### **S2\_2\_SolarPower(Anfield, Earle) Letters to the Editor** JST Vol.2, d m 2001

#### Viability of Solar Gravity Power

M J Anfield & M A G Earle

A U Thor (J Spec Tops., 1) postulates that gravitational energy is a viable source of power for the Sun. His simple model, in which he takes the core of the Sun to contain a growing black hole radiating at its Eddington limit, proves sufficient to power the Sun.

Consider a black hole at the centre of the Sun to be radiating at its Eddington limit. At the Eddington limit the pressure of the emitted photons exerts a force equal and opposite to that of gravity upon the accreting matter. From this we derive an equation relating the luminosity  $L_{\bullet}$  of the hole to its mass  $M_{bh}$

$$M_{bh} = \frac{\sigma_T}{4\pi G m_p} L_{\bullet} ,$$

where  $\sigma_T$  is the Thompson scattering cross-section. We calculate the mass of the black hole required to provide the solar luminosity to be  $6.5 \times 10^{25}$  kg. This is small in comparison to the mass of the Sun. If the matter of the black hole were at a density of  $10^{15}$  kg m<sup>-3</sup> it would have a diameter of only about 5 km. These findings support the 'Thor postulate' that gravitational energy from the collapse of a cloud of gas releases sufficient energy to power the Sun.

Note: Use of labeled heading

Punctuation of mathematical equations

The paper was accepted for publication by the referees, but it is far from the final word on the matter.

## Example referees report

A2R\_A1\_3\_Giants

### Significance of the work

Adams et al write in response to a letter by M Davies published in JST1.1. (A1\_3\_Giants). They have demonstrated that it may not be possible for an accurate measure to be made of the distance to the cluster LS101 using comparison of red giant luminosity because it would not be possible to resolve the individual stars.

### Method Used

The authors use results from their paper A1\_2\_Supernovae (JST1.2) and find the number of red giants within the cluster of 100 000 stars to be 17 620. They then assume a cluster radius of 3 pc, for which absolutely no justification is given. This allows them to find that the angular separation of the red dwarfs is  $0.694''$ . This is the limit of Earth based observation suggesting that Davies's results may be flawed.

### Conclusions

The method used by the authors is correct and accepting their assumption of the radius of a galactic cluster, produces an accurate result.

A resolution of  $0.694''$  is at the limit of observation and considering the possible error in the assumptions, this result may not be accurate. However, the result does fit well with what Davies says in his letter. A second method would be of use to confirm the result.

We believe that this paper is significant as it will prevent the inaccurate results given in Davies's letter being used. we therefore recommend the paper be accepted for publication.

Note: the header identifies the referees and the source paper (the absence of a list of names indicates that the whole group contributed)

There is no version number so this report is on the original submission

the language is polite and in correct English.

the reasons for recommending accepting the paper are clearly given (even if one might disagree with them!)

## **8. Publications**

The editorial board may, on consideration of the recommendations of the referees

- (i) accept a paper without changes
- (ii) ask the authors to respond to the changes suggested by the referee
- (iii) (exceptionally) reject a paper

Resubmitted papers that have been sent back for changes are then returned to the original referees for confirmation that required changes have been carried out correctly. Remember to post resubmissions as replies under the same topic with the correct version number.

Once the editorial board has recommended acceptance the final version of the paper will be posted in the current part of the journal and the original files archived. **This can be done only by the board manager. Students may submit and reply to topics in the submissions and refereeing section only.**

## **9. Online Help**

Just click on the **HELP** button on the WebBoard toolbar.