

**Professional File Review Rubric
2012-2013**

Articles published in biannual *Professional File* volumes are journal-length publications grounded in relevant literature that synthesize current issues, present new processes or models, or share practical applications related to institutional research. They differ from articles published in traditional academic journals in that they address fundamental aspects of institutional research work and are less focused on theory and theoretical perspectives.

If you have any questions or if a conflict of interest arises, please contact Chris Mullin (Coordinating Editor) and Leah Ross (AIR) at publications@airweb.org.

MANUSCRIPT INFORMATION

Manuscript No.: 2012-03

Title: *Programs for Engagement and Enhancement*

Date sent to reviewer: 12/12/12

Date due from reviewer: 1/4/13

Upon an initial review, this article appears to (check all that apply):

- Synthesize current issues
- Present new processes or models
- Share practical applications related to IR

YOUR RECOMMENDATION

Please use the Reviewer Guide on **page 2** to arrive at a recommendation.

- Accept for publication
- Request revisions
- Do not accept for publication

As this is a double-blind peer review, names of the authors and their affiliations have been withheld, and your name will not be shared with the author(s). When finished, please submit your comments along with this completed Review Form to publications@airweb.org.

Name (in lieu of signature):

Ken Scott, EdD

Reviewer Guide

Criteria	Score (1-low to 5-high or n/a)	Comments
Abstract		
The abstract tells the reader what the manuscript is about and highlights findings.		
Framing		
The problem is clearly defined.		
The purpose is clearly defined.		
The objectives and/or research questions are clearly articulated.		
Analysis		
The data sources are clearly identified.		
The methodology is clearly described.		
The limitations are identified.		
Findings/Results		
The results are clearly explained.		
The tables and figures supplement the text.		
The author distinguishes clearly between what is factual and what may be his/her interpretation of the data.		
Structure		
The manuscript has a logical flow.		
The manuscript is well-written.		
The tables and figures are labeled appropriately.		
Use of references reflects an understanding of the literature.		
Comments for the author(s)		
What are the strengths of the article?		
In what ways could the author improve the manuscript?		
Comments for the editor		
Why would this article be of interest to readers?		
Confidential thoughts for the editor.		