**TRANSFORM Rubric**

**Assessor (Please do not leave your name on this form)**

**Title of Article: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Directions: Assessors, please use this rubric and upload to Digital Commons. There are three parts of this rubric for you to provide feedback:

1. Score Column– Enter the numeric score of the criteria you are assessing.
2. Comments for Author Column – Provide feedback on the criteria you assessed.
3. Overall Comments for Author Row – Provide overall feedback for the author. This can include suggestions for revision on both content and style.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |  |  |
| **Criteria** | | **Exemplary** | **Acceptable** | **Acceptable with Minor Corrections** | **Requires Major Corrections** | **Unacceptable** | **Score** | **Comments for Author** |
| **Empirical Knowledge** | Expands empirical knowledge and/or adds value to the body of research/practice about interdisciplinary transformational change and transformational change leadership. | Paper is on the leading edge of research in TL AND is a major contribution to advance the state of knowledge and practice of TL. | Paper is on the leading edge of research in TL AND has sufficient contribution to advance the state of knowledge and practice of TL. | Paper is on the leading edge of research in TL BUT has insufficient contribution to advance the state of knowledge and practice of TL. | Paper is fairly on the leading edge of research in TL BUT does not have a clear contribution to advance the state of knowledge and practice of TL. | Paper is not on the forefront of research in TL OR does not have sufficient contribution to advance the state of knowledge and practice of TL. |  |  |
| **Review of Literature** | Examines literature surrounding the topic and identifies trends in the literature. Identifies theoretical and conceptual frameworks related to the topic. Synthesizes the work of seminal authors, researchers and practitioners on the topic. | Review of literature is clearly relevant, appropriate current AND Review of literature clearly synthesizes existing research and practice. | Review of literature is adequately relevant, appropriate and current AND Review of literature generally synthesizes existing research and practice. | Review of literature is inadequately relevant, appropriate and current OR Review of literature weakly synthesizes existing research and practice. | Review of literature is barely relevant, appropriate and current OR Review of literature weakly synthesizes existing research and practice. | Review of literature is not relevant, appropriate and current OR Review of literature does not synthesizes existing research and practice. |  |  |
| **Original Work** | Contains original research, analyses, or contributions to best practices informed by research. | Paper superbly showcases new research and practice in the area of TL. | Paper adequately addresses a new research topic or provides a new approach to TL. | Paper inadequately addresses a new research topic or provides a new approach to TL. | Paper minimally addresses a new research topic or provides a new approach to TL. | Paper does not address a new research topic or does not provide a new approach to TL. |  |  |
| **Data and Practice** | Rigorous scholarship and/or the logical development of relevant theory and/or practice. | Paper effectively uses informed data and/or practice appropriately in the area of TL. | Paper adequately uses informed data and/or practice appropriately in the area of TL. | Paper ineffectively uses informed data and/or practice appropriately in the area of TL. | Paper minimally uses informed data and/or practice appropriately in the area of TL. | Paper does not use informed data and/or practice appropriately in the area of TL. |  |  |
| **Conclusions and Recommendations** | Develop conclusions that are based on data or best practice. Make recommendations for theory and/or practice. | Conclusions and recommendations are firmly established, are sound theoretically or experimentally and are precisely supported by the facts presented. | Conclusions and recommendations are established, are sound theoretically or experimentally and are precisely supported by the facts presented. | Conclusions and recommendations are not clearly established, or are not strongly sound theoretically or experimentally or are weakly supported by the facts presented. | Conclusions and recommendations are weakly established, are weak theoretically or experimentally, or are barely supported by the facts presented. | Conclusions and recommendations are not established, are not sound theoretically or experimentally nor are not supported by the facts presented. |  |  |
| **Quality of Writing** | Quality of writing is structurally sound and presents continuity and flow of ideas, conciseness and clarity, smoothness of expression, tone, and precision. | Writing structure is superbly clear and organized, ideas are continuous and flows with logic, concepts are concise, precise and clear, ideas transition smoothly from one to the next, tone is academic and scholarly. | Writing structure is clear and organized, ideas are continuous and flows with logic, concepts are concise, precise and clear, ideas transition smoothly from one to the next, tone is academic and scholarly. | Writing needs minor corrections to be clear and organized, concepts and ideas need to transition smoothly, be more concise and precise, or the tone needs to be more academic and scholarly. | Writing needs need major corrections to be concise, clear and logcially organized, concepts may transition abruptly, or the tone needs to be more academic and scholarly. | Paper is not concise, clear, or logically organized OR is full of language errors OR is not academic or scholarly. |  |  |
| **Research Design and Methodology or Best Practice** | Research methods and/or best practices are scholarly and academic. | Research method and/or best practices are effectively utilized. | Research method and/or best practices are appropriately utilized. | Research method and/or best practices are generally evident, but needs minor corrections to meet journal expectations. | Research method and/or best practices are minimally utilized. | Research method and/or best practices are not utilized. |  |  |
|  | **Overall comments for author** |  | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SCORE GUIDELINES** | | | | | | |  |  |
| 5 | Exemplary; no weaknesses, top quality; recommended for journal publication | | | | | |  |  |
| 4 | Acceptable; no significant weaknesses; minor suggested revisions; recommended for publication | | | | | |  |  |
| 3 | Possibly acceptable; corrections of several minor weaknesses or one or more major weaknesses; possibly recommended for journal | | | | | |  |  |
| 2 | Major revisions required to be considered for journal publication | | | | | |  |  |
| 1 | Not journal quality; required level of revision too substantial | | | | | |  |  |