FURJ Review Rubric

** For each component, please highlight the text corresponding to "Ready for publication", "Publishable with revision", or "Major revisions but opportunity to resubmit".

Component	Ready for publication	Publishable with revisions	Major revisions but opportunity to resubmit	Comments
Introduction	Strong introduction of topic's key question(s). Specific thesis statement. Clearly delineates subtopics to be reviewed.	Conveys a topic but not the key question(s). General thesis statement. Hints at possible subtopics to be reviewed.	Does not adequately convey topic. Lacks adequate thesis statement. Does not describe subtopics to be reviewed.	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:
Literature Review	Contains a well-developed discussion of previous scholarship and integrates that discussion into their own work.	Contains some discussion of previous scholarship and what discussion there is, is not integrated into their own work.	Does not contain a discussion of previous scholarship.	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:
Focus / Argument (Critical evaluation of premise and support of points)	Argument is clearly stated. All parts of the paper are clearly related and prove the argument through the use of sources and organization of subtopics.	There is an argument but all of the paper does not relate to proving the argument. Some of the sources and / or subtopics do not relate the argument or do not contribute to the clarity of the argument.	Argument is unclear. The use of sources and organization of subtopics neither relates to nor contributes to clarity of argument.	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:

Methodology	The methodology is appropriate to discipline and is clearly explained.	The methodology is appropriate to discipline but the discussion of that methodology is unclear to the reader.	The methodology is not appropriate to discipline or it is not clearly explained.	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:
Development of Argument	Identifies the argument and offers significant evidence in support of the argument.	An argument is present but left to the reader to surmise. Some of the evidence does not support the argument.	Does not identify the argument. Support for the argument is inadequate or superficial. Parts of the argument are underdeveloped.	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:
Organization / Flow	The sequence and organization of the paper supports the development of the argument and clarity of the argument. Strong transitions link subtopics and main topic.	The overall arrangement is clear but digressions can make the paper difficult to follow. Sometimes uses transitions and / or the transitions sometimes link the subtopics and main topic.	Arrangement is haphazard and difficult to follow. Paper strays substantially from topic. Transitions are unclear or none existent.	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:
Support / Use of Sources	Strong use and varied mix of primary sources and secondary scholarship. Source material	May lack either primary sources or secondary literature and thus the thesis is not supported	Few primary sources or secondary scholarship supporting thesis. If used,	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:

	is effectively integrated into and synthesized in the author's writing.	as strongly as it could. There are instances when the source material substitutes for the author's ideas.	the source material frequently substitutes for the author's ideas.	
Conclusion	Strong review of key conclusions and engagement with the thesis statement. Insightful discussion of impact of the research material on the topic.	Cursorily reviews key conclusions and somewhat engages with the thesis statement. May discuss superficially or not at all the impact of the researched material on the topic.	Does not summarize evidence with respect to the thesis statement. Does not discuss the impact of researched material on the topic.	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:
Style (Grammar and Mechanics)	The paper is free of grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors. Sentences are clear, effective coherent; vocabulary is broad.	The paper has enough grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors that it should be sent back to the author for revision. Some sentences are confusing or ineffective.	Grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors substantially detract from paper. Sentences are incoherent.	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:
Citation and References (according to disciplinary specific style)	All references and citations are correctly written and present.	A few references and citations are missing or	Reference and citation errors significantly detract from paper.	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:

		incorrectly written.		
Audience	Discipline specific jargon is clearly defined and the paper is understandable to other readers.	Some discipline specific jargon may not be defined and / or parts of the paper may not be understandable to other readers.	Discipline specific jargon is not defined and / or the paper is not understandable to other readers.	Editorial Board: Disciplinary Reviewer:

FURJ Review Rubric

Checklist of Errors

_____ Reference errors: no reference given where one is needed

_____ Punctuation and Capitalization errors

_____ Citation errors: order of authors, punctuation of the citation

_____ Verb problems: verb tense, verb-subject-article agreement

_____ Pronoun errors: which, that, who, whom

_____ Format errors: word spacing, margins, spacing, pagination

_____ Undefined abbreviations

_____ Non-professional writing/tone

_____ Lack of empirical evidence for points made / unsubstantiated arguments

_____ Other: _____

Reviewer's overall feedback and suggestions:
Editorial Board:

Disciplinary Reviewer:

Reviewer's final decision regarding publication:
Editorial Board:

Disciplinary Reviewer: