

## International Journal of Whole Schooling

### Article Review Rubric – Commentary, Practice, and Advocacy articles

**Article Title:**

**Reviewer Name:**

<b>Type of article</b> - Research - ‘Voices’ - Practice - Opinion - Review	<b>Style</b> (please place an X next to the boxes which apply)	<b>Content</b> (please place an X next to the boxes which apply)
<b>Suitable for immediate publication</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Arguments made in a logical and concise manner.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Plain language consistently used throughout.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> ‘Person first’ language is consistently used throughout</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate length for the topic.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Full adherence to APA style.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate use of tense and grammatical structures.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Free of spelling errors.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Full referencing according to APA guidelines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Content is highly relevant to current discourse on the topic.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> If references are used they are current</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Commentary or description of practice and advocacy is original and represents a significant contribution to discourse on the topic.</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Logical conclusions are drawn.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Implications for future practice or policy are highlighted</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Discussion is consistent with the 6 principles of Whole Schooling.</li> </ul>
<b>Suitable for publication with revisions</b> (Please list suggested revisions on ‘page 2’)  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> To satisfaction of editors</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> New review required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are made in a logical manner.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Some redundancies and passages to be trimmed.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Plain language generally used.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> ‘Person first’ language is used most of the time.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Mostly adheres to APA style.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate use of tense and grammatical structures.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Free of spelling errors.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> APA Referencing attempted but imperfect.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Few ‘clumsy’ passages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Content is relevant to current discourse on the topic.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> References, where used, require updating.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Commentary or description of practice and advocacy is original and could represent a contribution to discourse on the topic if written with greater clarity.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Logical conclusions are drawn, but are incomplete.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Implications for future practice or policy are implied but not made explicit</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Discussion is consistent with the 6 principles of Whole Schooling.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Unsuitable for publication</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Evidence of plagiarism or improper referencing.</li> <li>□ Incoherent and ‘clumsy’ passages.</li> <li>□ Arguments are not made in a logical and concise manner. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Plain language not used.</li> </ul> </li> <li>□ ‘Person first’ language is rarely or never used.</li> <li>□ Inappropriate length for the topic.</li> <li>□ Little adherence to APA style.</li> <li>□ Inappropriate use of tense and grammatical structures.</li> <li>□ Significant spelling errors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Content is outdated or irrelevant.</li> <li>□ References, where used, are outdated.</li> <li>□ Arguments are not original.</li> <li>□ Illogical conclusions or no conclusions are drawn.</li> <li>□ No implications for future practice or advocacy are highlighted</li> <li>□ Discussion is inconsistent with the 6 principles of Whole Schooling.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

**General impressions and further comments:**

**Specific advice on what is required to make this article suitable for publication (if not already). What types of support might the author require?**