

Research & Practice in Assessment Journal Article Review Rubric



	Ideal Fit with RPA	Potentially Publishable in RPA	Not a Good Fit for RPA
Audience who will find this of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Higher education assessment community; faculty and staff undertaking assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Some in higher education but NOT those in assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Only those outside higher education
Currency	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus on high-interest current/ emerging issue(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Issue(s) are of limited current or emerging interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Issue(s) are of little or no current or emerging interest
Applicability	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly applicable across a variety of higher ed environments	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited applicability or applicability is not explicitly addressed	<input type="checkbox"/> Unique situation that is not obviously applicable to others
Originality/ innovation	<input type="checkbox"/> Novel research, work, thinking, or application of a prior theory; new framing of a problem or solution	<input type="checkbox"/> Applying an established assessment theory or approach with little that is novel	<input type="checkbox"/> Nothing apparently novel about theory, approach, or application; similar work or ideas have already been published
Potential impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Likely to transform others' approaches to assessment; likely to have an enduring, substantive impact on discussion and practice among a wide range of assessment researchers and practitioners	<input type="checkbox"/> Interesting; potential to have some impact on others' approaches to assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Little likelihood of impacting others' discussion, practice, or approaches to assessment
Theoretical foundation	<input type="checkbox"/> Thorough engagement with relevant, current scholarly literature; key sources are included	<input type="checkbox"/> Adequate engagement with relevant scholarly literature; some key sources may be missing; some sources may be dated	<input type="checkbox"/> No scholarly context provided
Methodology, analysis, and argumentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate, sound, & clearly explained methodology, analysis, and argumentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Applicability and impact are affected by limitations in methodology (such as limited sampling or lack of instrument validation), or vaguely described methodology, analysis, or argumentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Methodology, analysis, or argumentation are absent
Conclusions	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions clearly flow from research findings and/or argument; are compared with the conclusions of others; include implications for assessment practice	<input type="checkbox"/> Conclusions are largely opinions proposing untested theories, models, or approaches	<input type="checkbox"/> No clear conclusions
Readability	<input type="checkbox"/> Professionally written; well organized; easily understood by newcomers to assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> While overall arguments can be grasped, occasionally unclear or difficult to follow, or inappropriate tone	<input type="checkbox"/> Language and/or organization impede the impact of the argument